

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 19, 1987

The House met at 11 a.m.

Rev. Eugene J. O'Brien, S.J., Fordham University, New York, NY, offered the following prayer:

To the God who is Lord and Father of us all who gave us our heads and our hearts, our homes and our homeland, and all this heart-filling, heart-breaking world, let us bow our heads and pray:

Father, clear our heads of small and selfish thoughts so that we may savor Your wisdom;

Father, cleanse our hearts of anxious, angry feelings so that they may open with Your generosity;

Father, protect our homes from our hurting, heedless ways so that they be our haven of understanding and of love;

Father, bless our homeland, with Your peace and our pride so that it may be a beacon for Your weary world; and

Father, stretch our heads and hearts and our sometimes tired arms to embrace all Your world and all its people, Your beloved sons and daughters, our fractious brothers and sisters, so that we strengthen them with our faith in You, and lift them with hope in themselves, and heal them with this weary world's one and only healing, our love—and Yours—today and all our days. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REV. EUGENE J. O'BRIEN, S.J.

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is a personal privilege and special honor for me to welcome Father Eugene J. O'Brien to our Nation's Capital, and to thank him for delivering today's opening prayer.

Father O'Brien is a most distinguished and respected theologian, educator, and administrator from my hometown of the Bronx. Presently, he serves as assistant to the president of Fordham University, one of our Nation's finest institutions of higher learning. However, his impressive credentials also include four decades of teaching and administration at such

other prestigious schools as Fairfield College Prep in Fairfield, CT, Mount St. Mary's College in Emmitsburg, MD, and St. Peter's Prep in Jersey City, NJ.

But, more than anything else, I will always value the 19½ years of outstanding service Father O'Brien provided as headmaster of Fordham Prep in the Bronx. His job there was to prepare his students for college and the professional challenges that awaited them. He did his job well and thousands of parents are indebted to him for the profound influence he has had on their children's lives—I know, I am one of those parents.

My own son, Mario, Jr., attended Fordham Prep under the tutelage of Father O'Brien and he is the better man today for having done so. Upon Mario's graduation from Fordham Prep he attended Columbia University, although he was accepted at such other prestigious schools as Harvard and Yale. Today he is a fine young attorney—a son who has made his parents very proud.

I want to publicly thank Father O'Brien for helping prepare him, and so many other young people for such rewarding lives, and for being a close and valued family friend.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to designate March 20, 1987, as "National Energy Education Day."

The message also announced that the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) entitled "Joint resolution disapproving the provision of additional assistance to the Nicaraguan democratic resistance pursuant to title II of the Military Construction Appropriations Act of 1987" did fail to pass the Senate.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Laws 94-304 and 99-7, the Chair on behalf of the Vice President appoints Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. McCURE, and Mr. WALLOP, to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 276(h)-276(k), of title 22, of the United States Code, as amended, the Chair on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. GRAMM as vice chairman of the Senate delegation to the Mexico-United States In-

terparliamentary Group during the 100th Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 42 and 43, of title 20, of the United States Code, the Chair on behalf of the Vice President appoints Mr. GARN as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, vice Mrs. KASSEBAUM, resigned.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked to proceed for this 1 minute to inquire of the distinguished majority leader the program for the balance of this week and next week.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished Republican leader yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the program for today is the consideration of the funding of committees resolution.

The program for next week will include the House meeting at noon on Monday, the 23d of March, in pro forma session and on Tuesday, March 24, at noon to consider under suspension of the rules H.R. 568 to establish the San Pedro Riparian National Conservation Area in Arizona.

On Wednesday, March 25, and the balance of the week, the House will consider, subject to a rule being granted, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal 1988.

Conference reports may be brought up, of course, at any time, and a further program may be announced later.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

IN MEMORIAM TO MRS. JOHN McVAY

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of Mrs. John McVay—known affectionately to all who knew her as Ann—marked the passing of one of most able, dedicated and well-liked employees of the House. Mrs. McVay began her service here in the House with the late Les Arends of Illinois in 1969. Later she transferred to

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

the Journal Clerk's Office and until her death she served as the minority enrolling clerk of the House.

Ann was always willing to take the time to help others in the office when needed. This was true even when she had her own troubles.

She was a very talented person who was proficient in many areas. Ann loved to garden and was very knowledgeable about the subject. She loved to sew and make outfits for herself and others and was also excellent at crafts and needlepoint.

Ann shared these gifts with others by showing them how to make things so that they in fact felt they had accomplished something. When the task was over, Ann shared in that person's happiness.

Ann McVay was one of those unsung, effective, public servants whose dedication and patriotism are so important to this institution and to democracy.

She was a good friend and we will all miss her.

□ 1110

She was a very dear friend, and I am sure I share the sentiments of all the Members of this House and the staff, who will miss her greatly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHROEDER). We thank the gentleman from Illinois for his very moving 1 minute.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 23, 1987

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1044

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1044.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

APRIL SHOWERS WON'T BRING MAY FLOWERS

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, the adage "April showers bring May flowers" will have to be revised this year. This new saying will be "April showers may bring disaster."

The advent of spring, which starts tomorrow, Madam Speaker, means increased precipitation in areas across the country and the Great Lakes, already at record high levels, are threatening to go even higher.

It is not just private landowners who are threatened by the high water levels. Public water plants, public recreational areas and public roads are located on the Great Lakes' shoreline and all are in further danger of sustaining severe water damage.

There is no fast or easy solution to the problem. It is not as simple as "pulling the plug" and diverting the water elsewhere. We also cannot mandate Canada to close its hydropower facilities which divert up to 4 billion extra gallons of water into the Great Lakes.

It is going to take a cooperative effort, Madam Speaker, among all Great Lake States and Members of this body to address the problem. I hope we can work together as a group to formulate a plan that will be beneficial to all involved and I will have more to say on this soon, Madam Speaker.

PAKISTANI NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

(Mr. MARKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, the Pakistani nuclear scientist, Mr. Abdul Khan, recently said that Pakistan has a nuclear bomb.

We have a law that says we will not assist a nation which is building a nuclear bomb. The question is, Do we mean what we say?

The Pakistani Government claims that its nuclear program is purely peaceful. If that's true, they can sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty and open their reactors to international inspection.

But if it's not true, Congress cannot stand idly by while General Zia thumbs his nose at American law and American nonproliferation policy.

Last month, the American Ambassador warned the Pakistanis about their nuclear program, and urged them to sign the NPT.

But then the State Department turned around and urged Congress to exempt Pakistan from the Glenn-Symington nonproliferation amendment.

Enough is enough, Madam Speaker. It's time for us to stand up to General Zia.

I intend to ensure, by legislation, that Pakistan cannot continue building a nuclear bomb while it gets American assistance.

There should be no waiver of the Glenn-Symington requirements and no aid to Pakistan until it complies with nonproliferation law.

There are already too many nuclear bombs in too many countries. It's time to show we're serious about nuclear nonproliferation.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT INTRODUCTION

(Mr. WELDON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON. Madam Speaker, less than 2 years ago, Congress passed the historic Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law to incrementally achieve a balanced budget by 1991. Yet already this year we're hearing Members of this body call for increased annual spending limits under Gramm-Rudman.

What kind of message does this send to the American people? I think it says that despite a raging \$2 trillion debt, Congress still lacks the self-discipline to get the deficit under control.

As a mayor of a city and as chairman of a county government, I was required to balance local budgets despite intense public pressures to increase spending. It's time Congress learns to do the same.

That's why I am introducing the balanced budget/tax limitation amendment to the Constitution. This amendment will impose fiscal discipline on Congress and the executive branch, by mandating two simple requirements:

First, it would require Congress to adopt a balanced budget for each fiscal year. Only a three-fifths majority of both Houses or a state of war could waive this requirement.

Second, it would limit tax increases each year to the growth in national income, unless Congress specifically votes for a tax increase.

I am honored to be able to introduce this bill which our esteemed colleague, Barber Conable, introduced when he served in the House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, the American people want deficit reduction and a healthy economy. They want a balanced budget. Already, 32 States have passed legislation calling for a balanced Federal budget. Now Congress should do its part to get serious budget reduction back on track. The balanced budget amendment will ensure that this happens, and I urge my colleagues to support this long-overdue legislation.

SUPPORT NATIONAL TISSUE AND ORGAN DONOR AWARENESS WEEK

(Mr. DYMALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DYMALLY. Madam Speaker, Kevin Lorenzo Reid is a 2-year-old black child who has been hospitalized in Pittsburgh's Children's Hospital since March 10, 1987. He is suffering from biliary atresia a degenerative liver disease which requires a liver transplant. This condition causes liver disease, jaundice and cirrhosis of the liver in children.

Biliary atresia, is a disease of unknown causes which produces inflammation and obstruction of bile ducts. Kevin's life and the lives of his family have been grossly impaired due to the emotional and physical strain of his condition.

Therefore, with my two distinguished colleagues, Mr. NELSON of Florida and Mr. ESPY of Mississippi, I urge our colleagues to support the National Tissue and Organ Donor Awareness Week.

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES BY STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES IN THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 100TH CONGRESS

Mr. GAYDOS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 108) providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for the expenses of investigations and studies by standing and select committees of the House in the 1st session of the 100th Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WALKER. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, why were the 1-minute speeches suddenly cut off when Members were waiting to deliver 1-minutes in the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the Speaker had made a prior agreement with the minority leadership that we would suspend 1-minutes and move to the business of the House because of many Members' prior arrangements, and that we would go back to 1-minutes after the business of the day had been completed.

That was a prior agreement between the Speaker and the minority leader as soon as House Administration was ready to proceed with the business that was on the floor today.

Mr. WALKER. I have a further parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker. It seems to me that—I am glad to

know that there was an arrangement made. The fact is that the Chair did take some and not all; it seems to me that Members who came with the idea of making a 1-minute at this point are being inconvenienced when somebody else just decides that it is time to act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When the Committee on House Administration sought recognition, we then recognized them. They did not seek recognition before.

In the interim, let me assure the gentleman that anyone who wants to give 1-minutes will not be interrupted after the business of the House is done, and that many who wanted to do 1-minutes went back to their offices because they were told that the 1-minutes would be suspended, and that is why there were so few. So we will proceed as soon as we are ready to.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 108

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House in accordance with this primary expense resolution not more than the amount specified in section 2 for investigations and studies by each committee named in such section, including expenses—

(1) in the case of a committee named in section 3, for procurement of consultant services under section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; and

(2) in the case of a committee named in section 4, for provision of assistance for members of professional staff in obtaining specialized training under section 202(j) of such Act.

SEC. 2. The committees and amounts referred to in the first section are: Select Committee on Aging, \$1,541,002; Committee on Agriculture, \$1,624,233; Committee on Armed Services, \$1,994,779; Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, \$3,243,480; Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, \$737,986; Committee on the District of Columbia, \$351,000; Committee on Education and Labor, \$3,282,893; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$4,803,752; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$2,811,950; Committee on Government Operations, \$3,044,936; Committee on House Administration, \$1,066,500; Committee on House Administration—House Information Systems, \$7,960,000; Select Committee on Hunger, \$616,217; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$58,000; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, \$1,658,920; Committee on the Judiciary, \$2,398,260; Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, \$1,954,560; Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, \$750,000; Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, \$1,518,600; Committee on Public Works and Transportation, \$2,179,686; Committee on Rules, \$591,000; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$3,268,625; Committee on Small Business, \$1,080,500; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$400,000; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$691,102; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$3,182,000.

SEC. 3. (a) Of the amounts provided for in section 2, each committee named in subsection (b) may use not more than the amount

specified in such subsection for consultant services under paragraph (1) of the first section.

(b) The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Select Committee on Aging, \$5,000; Committee on Armed Services, \$40,000; Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, \$5,000; Committee on the District of Columbia, \$15,500; Committee on Education and Labor, \$80,035; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$25,000; Committee on House Administration, \$75,000; Committee on House Administration—House Information Systems, \$400,000; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$5,000; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, \$7,500; Committee on the Judiciary, \$100,000; Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, \$25,000; Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, \$100,000; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$10,000; Committee on Small Business, \$20,000; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$300,000; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$29,000; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$12,000.

SEC. 4. (a) Of the amounts provided for in section 2, each committee named in subsection (b) may use not more than the amount specified in such subsection for specialized training under paragraph (2) of the first section.

(b) The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Select Committee on Aging, \$1,000; Committee on Armed Services, \$7,000; Committee on the District of Columbia, \$2,500; Committee on Education and Labor, \$10,000; Committee on Government Operations, \$1,000; Committee on House Administration, \$12,000; Committee on House Administration—House Information Systems, \$180,000; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, \$2,000; Committee on the Judiciary, \$2,000; Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, \$5,200; Committee on Rules, \$3,000; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$11,600; Committee on Small Business, \$600; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$3,000; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$2,500.

SEC. 5. The Committee on House Administration

(1) shall, through House Information Systems, develop, operate, maintain, and improve computer and information services for the House, including direct computer and information systems support for Members, committees, administrative offices, and other governmental entities, and shall conduct necessary investigations and studies of such services;

(2) is authorized to receive reimbursement for services under paragraph (1) and to expend amounts so reimbursed in accordance with policies of the committee; and

(3) is authorized to provide for professional development programs, office and personnel management consultation services, and periodic publication of hand books, guides, bulletins, and other items necessary for the House.

SEC. 6. Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 7. Amounts shall be available under this resolution for investigations and studies carried out during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1987, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 1988.

SEC. 8. Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance

with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 9. The Committee on House Administration shall have authority to make adjustments in amounts under section 2, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 252(a) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any reduction in appropriations for the purposes of section 2.

Mr. GAYDOS (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute: Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House in accordance with this primary expense resolution not more than the amount specified in section 2 for investigations and studies by each committee named in such section, including expenses—

(1) in the case of a committee named in section 3, for procurement of consultant services under section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; and

(2) in the case of a committee named in section 4, for provision of assistance for members of professional staff in obtaining specialized training under section 202(j) of such Act.

SEC. 2. The committees and amounts referred to in the first section are: Select Committee on Aging, \$1,361,144; Committee on Agriculture, \$1,549,145; Committee on Armed Services, \$1,609,250; Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, \$2,976,788; Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, \$674,812; Committee on the District of Columbia, \$291,326; Committee on Education and Labor, \$3,125,887; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$4,577,717; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$2,655,583; Committee on Government Operations, \$2,653,359; Committee on House Administration, \$1,062,359; Committee on House Administration—House Information Systems, \$7,378,998; Select Committee on Hunger, \$577,446; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$58,000; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, \$1,630,203; Committee on the Judiciary, \$1,877,727; Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, \$1,927,270; Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, \$620,482; Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, \$1,451,977; Committee on Public Works and Transportation, \$2,090,184; Committee on Rules, \$569,740; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$2,163,977; Committee on Small Business, \$907,655; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$400,000; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$548,321; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$3,168,083.

SEC. 3. (a) Of the amounts provided for in section 2, each committee named in subsection (b) may use not more than the amount

specified in such subsection for consultant services under paragraph (1) of the first section.

(b) The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Select Committee on Aging, \$5,000; Committee on Armed Services, \$40,000; Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, \$5,000; Committee on the District of Columbia, \$15,500; Committee on Education and Labor, \$80,035; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$25,000; Committee on House Administration, \$75,000; Committee on House Administration—House Information Systems, \$400,000; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$5,000; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, \$7,500; Committee on the Judiciary, \$100,000; Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, \$25,000; Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, \$100,000; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$10,000; Committee on Small Business, \$20,000; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$300,000; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$29,000; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$12,000.

SEC. 4. (a) Of the amounts provided for in section 2, each committee named in subsection (b) may use not more than the amount specified in such subsection for specialized training under paragraph (2) of the first section.

(b) The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Armed Services, \$7,000; Committee on the District of Columbia, \$2,500; Committee on Education and Labor, \$10,000; Committee on Government Operations, \$1,000; Committee on House Administration, \$12,000; Committee on House Administration—House Information Systems, \$180,000; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, \$2,000; Committee on the Judiciary, \$2,000; Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, \$5,200; Committee on Rules, \$3,000; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$11,600; Committee on Small Business, \$600; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$3,000; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$2,500.

SEC. 5. The Committee on House Administration—

(1) shall, through House Information Systems, develop, operate, maintain, and improve computer and information services for the House, including direct computer and information systems support for Members, committees, administrative offices, and other governmental entities, and shall conduct necessary investigations and studies of such services;

(2) is authorized to receive reimbursement for services under paragraph (1) and to expend amounts so reimbursed in accordance with policies of the committee; and

(3) is authorized to provide for professional development programs, office and personnel management consultation services, and periodic publication of handbooks, guides, bulletins, and other items necessary for the House.

SEC. 6. Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 7. Amounts shall be available under this resolution for investigations and studies carried out during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1987, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 1988.

SEC. 8. Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 9. The Committee on House Administration shall have authority to make adjustments in amounts under section 2, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 252(a) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any reduction in appropriations for the purposes of section 2.

Mr. GAYDOS (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GAYDOS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

RESTORING INCOME AVERAGING FOR FARMERS

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS] for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this has to do with reform of tax reform. This Congress of ours is going to have to grapple with the issue of trying to put right some of the wrongs that were embedded into the tax reform that is now the law of the land.

□ 1120

Income averaging was wiped out by tax reform and this hit our farmers right in the solar plexus.

I am today introducing a bill to restore income averaging for farmers who have suffered a natural disaster in the preceding taxable year. In those narrow circumstances where a tornado or some natural disaster wipes out an entire crop and therefore the income of a farmer, we ought to give that individual the right to income average, to balance off that tremendous loss against other earning years. I ask that the Members of the House cosponsor this legislation as quickly as possible.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GAYDOS. Madam Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BADHAM], the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Accounts, for purposes of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume, with the understanding that any additional time I may yield will be subject to the specific limitation, for debate purposes only.

Madam Speaker, before I explain the committee amendment, I wish to thank all of the members of the Accounts Subcommittee for their hard work in considering each budget request from the respective committees.

Attendance at each of the sessions was excellent.

The product which I present to the House has the support of a united subcommittee. It is not perfect, but it does reflect the best possible agreement that could be crafted in the spirit of reasonable compromise.

In particular, I wish to thank the minority members of the subcommittee, BOB BADHAM, BILL THOMAS, and PAT ROBERTS for their thoughtful hard work. BILL THOMAS must clearly be singled out for his perfect attendance and discerning analyses. His contribution to the work of the subcommittee was exceptional. Additionally, I am grateful to BILL FRENZEL for participating ex officio in the subcommittees' budget review process. He played a significant role in constructing this agreement. In my judgment, the minority members made constructive and significant contributions to the policies which guided our deliberations.

On the majority side, AL SWIFT, MARY ROSE OAKAR, TONY COELHO, BILL CLAY, SAM GEJDESON, and LEON PANETTA are to be commended for their consistently effective hard work during the subcommittee's deliberations.

If nothing else, this year represents a victory for the congressional decisionmaking process. The 3-hour subcommittee markup session must stand out as a model to others. It demonstrated that Members with different views can reach a sound rational consensus if attempted with consideration, cooperation, and good faith.

Additionally, I wish to thank all the chairmen and ranking minority members from the respective committees and their staffs. Their cooperation with the Accounts Subcommittee enabled us to evaluate all the budgetary requests in a thorough and timely manner.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is the product of the deliberations of the Subcommittee on Accounts over each committee's budgetary request. The subcommittee's proposed amendment was subsequently adopted unanimously without change by the full committee on House Administration. It represents a truly bipartisan agreement. The amendment provides a total authorization of \$47,907,433 for investigations and studies by all the standing and select committees of the House including HIS, with the exception of the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget, for 1987. This total amount represents an 8.93-percent increase over the total 1986 authorization of \$43,978,584. The actual dollar increase over 1986 is \$3,928,849. The sum total of all the budget requests for 1987 was \$52,809,981, representing a 20.8-percent increase over the 1986 authorization. The amendment's proposed authorization for 1987 cuts the

total budget requests by \$4,902,548. Furthermore, the proposed 1987 authorization is \$105,772 less than the total amount of \$48,013,205 authorized for 1985.

Compared to 1980, the proposed 1987 authorization represents only an 8.87-percent increase. In 1980, the sum total authorization of all the committee expense resolutions was \$44,005,969. Thus, 7 years later, the proposed total authorization is only \$3,901,464 greater than in 1980. Viewed from another important vantage point, over the 7-year period of 1981 through 1987, when the Accounts Subcommittee was chaired by either FRANK ANNUNZIO or myself, the average annual growth rate is 1.27 percent if the pending amendment is approved.

Additionally, for 1984, the year prior to my chairmanship of the subcommittee, the total actual authorization was \$45,815,766. The proposed authorization contained in the pending amendment is only \$2,091,667 larger than the 1984 level for a 4.57-percent increase. For the period of 1985 through 1987, during which I have chaired the subcommittee, the average annual growth rate is 1.52 percent. Thus, using the vantage points of 1980 and 1984, these dollar increases and average annual growth rates do not appear to be excessive or unreasonable.

In making its determinations, the subcommittee did not use any set mathematical formula. Instead, it evaluated each budget proposal on its own merits. Proposed spending levels in each of the respective budget categories and anticipated work loads were examined very carefully. Increased funding was based on such factors as the pay comparability increase, merit raises, increased travel plans and the need for additional personnel. It should be noted that due to the effect of sequestration in 1986, there was no pay comparability salary adjustment for Federal employees, including legislative branch employees, and, additionally, very few committee employees received any merit salary increases in 1986. Furthermore, due to sequestration, committees' travel activities were dramatically restricted. Many committees, also, had to cut personnel. This situation significantly affected the ability of many committees to discharge their legitimate oversight and legislative responsibilities.

The final product, embodied in this amendment, attempts to direct most of the large dollar increases to major legislative standing committees which had justified substantial anticipated work loads for 1987 to the subcommittee, such as Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Armed Services, Banking, Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, and Interior. Some small committees, such as Veterans' Affairs and House Administration were, also, awarded signifi-

cant and justifiable large percentage increases. On the other hand, a judgment was made to treat four select committees uniformly by providing them with only a 3-percent increase for pay comparability salary adjustments and inflation. A decision was also made not to increase the authorized funds for HIS above its 1986 level until the Committee on House Administration had the opportunity to make a detailed review of the activities, functions, and direction of HIS.

Most importantly, since for the fiscal year beginning on October 1, 1987, the appropriations level has not been established, and since the possibility of sequestration does exist, the amendment provides authority for the Committee on House Administration to make adjustments in the authorized amounts if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 252(a) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, or to conform to any reduction in the applicable appropriations. Similar authority was granted to this committee through the 1986 omnibus primary expense resolution.

On the subject of discrimination based on gender in the determination of compensation for committee employees, I wish to indicate that the provisions of clause 9 of House rule 43 govern such determinations. Enforcement of this clause is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. However, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Accounts, I have encouraged the committee chairmen and the ranking minority members to review their compensation practices on a continuing basis to assure compliance with clause 9 of House rule 43. This encouragement was made on the record during the hearings on the individual primary expense resolutions and in the annual budget review meetings between the staff of the Accounts Subcommittee and the staff directors of the respective committees. During the past 3 years improvements have been made. More and more women are occupying key policy making positions at the subcommittee and full committee levels, for example, women hold the positions of staff director of the Committee on Education and Labor and chief counsel of the Committee on the Judiciary. On the Committee on House Administration, the minority staff director is a woman and three of the six subcommittees have a woman as top staff person. On the Committee on Ways and Means, three of the six subcommittees have women as staff directors. These are but a few of many examples indicating substantial progress.

Finally, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute and the resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BADHAM. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 108, the committee funding resolution for calendar year 1987.

□ 1130

First of all, I would like to thank all of the members of the Accounts Subcommittee, and particularly the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS], for all of his dedication and guidance during this process which was somewhat different this year. It was, indeed, again not an easy process at all.

Each committee budget request deserves careful consideration. Each committee budget request has special needs, and it is our job to ensure that the proper needs are met with appropriate funding amounts.

However, it is also our job to determine what fat and what lean is in these budget requests and to separate them into different categories, of course.

The total amount requested from all committees, including standing committees, select committees, and House Information Systems was \$52,809,981, which was 20 percent over the amount that was authorized in 1986.

We managed to cut these budget requests by almost \$5 million, \$4,902,548, to be exact, and bring the total amount authorized for 1987 down to \$47,907,433, or an 8.93-percent increase over 1986 total authorization.

We all remember that last year, the year of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings cuts, for committee budgets, that meant a 9.1-percent reduction across the board last year. For that event made this year even more difficult because each committee came to the Committee on House Administration, the Subcommittee on Accounts, and reported to us that each committee, in its own right, had suffered greatly under the last year's cut of 9.1 percent, and each claimed to need special attention this year.

We on the Subcommittee on Accounts knew this to be true from our own experiences on this and the other committees upon which we serve.

Committee travel in the United States was down; numbers of hearings were reduced; employees were furloughed in some cases, so we were particularly sensitive to the greater needs of all the committees as they tried to make up for lost time of last year with the cut.

However, we want Gramm/Rudman to stand as a model, not as some legislative aberration that occurred in 1 year and then would be ignored and put on the shelf forevermore. That is why we worked hard to cut those re-

quests and bring budgets down to a reasonable level while, at the same time, allowing room for the committees to do the jobs for which they are assigned.

We feel that we have done that with this package, so I am pleased to be able to support this resolution, as I have not always supported these resolutions in the past.

We feel that the modest increase is the best we could do, given the circumstances and the particular needs throughout the committee system for the upcoming year. We on the minority side are particularly grateful to the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS], for the matter in which he conducted the hearing schedule.

It was different this year from previous years in that, rather than handle two or three committees in 1 day and then decide their fate at the end of the day, we decided it would be fitting, indeed proper, to handle all the committee's testimony and then go over them in the relationship that each committee had to the whole amount that we thought was available.

We felt included on the minority side; we felt to be a part of the nuts and bolts that make up this budget process. I think the process worked smoothly. I think the process under the tremendous constraints, we felt, worked well.

I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 108, the committee funding resolution for 1987.

Mr. GAYDOS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point, the remarks of the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, Mr. ANNUNZIO, who is unable to be with us today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHROEDER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Madam Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on House Administration, I am delighted at the manner in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BADHAM] and the other members of the subcommittee, from both sides of the aisle, approached the committee funding measure this year.

Last year, every committee of the House was subject to the crippling effect of sequestration. Some cut or furloughed personnel; most eliminated field hearings, witness fees, and publications. All committees cut costs—some more, and some less. We all paid the penalty to help this debtor Nation begin the long climb out of the huge deficit hole.

As happens every year, there are Members who oppose these funding resolutions. The committees of the House will be subject to the first of many blows the floor will strike as we struggle to deal with the trillion plus dollar debt that hangs over us all. But, bear in mind

that the committees of the House are the heart and soul of the Congress.

It is through the committee system that the American people have a strong and direct voice on legislative matters. If we cut too deep, we reduce our ability to respond to the people. This year, we come to the floor with a resolution that is reasonable and economical, and that will serve the American people.

We who serve on the House Administration Committee have the responsibility of carefully scrutinizing each expenditure, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his subcommittee have done that.

I urge your support and vote for House Resolution 108.

Mr. GAYDOS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], a member of the committee, for purposes of debate only.

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, first of all, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member and all of the members for the cooperation that they showed in putting this resolution together.

I want briefly to address the budget issues that are raised with regard to this funding resolution.

First of all, I think Members ought to know that the increase here, the average increase, is about 8.9 percent for each of the committees. Last year, however, as a result of sequestration, all committees were cut 10 percent. So in effect we are not even getting back to the same level of funding remaining after sequestration last year.

In addition to that, the funding here is less than what was funded for the committees in 1985. In 1985, the funding was \$48 million; for this year, we are talking about \$47.9 million. So we have not even reached the level of funding that was provided for the committees in 1985.

In addition to that, for those who ask the question: "Does this meet the budget resolution baseline," the answer to that is, "Yes," because the appropriation that we are using here was, in fact, adopted last year. The appropriation under the legislative branch appropriations bill met the 302(b) spending levels provided in the budget resolution.

So the proposal that we bring here, within is the budget resolution levels. Furthermore, we have cut almost \$5 million from the levels requested by the various committees, and in addition to that, we have included language that would make the committees again subject to sequestration if, in fact, we reach that point later this year.

So this resolution does a very adequate job in not only trying to provide sufficient funding to the committees, but in meeting our budget needs as well.

For that reason, I urge the membership to support this resolution.

Mr. BADHAM. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL], the vice chairman of the committee.

Mr. FRENZEL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the matter before the House. It is not my normal style to support an 8.9-percent increase in spending for anything. It is also not my normal practice to support this particular resolution.

However, for reasons which I will describe a little more fully as we move along, I believe this year the committee funding resolution is one that is worthy of the support of the Members of this House.

First, I want to give a little redundant praise to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Accounts, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS], and to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO], who chairs the full committee, for opening up the process so that we could jointly do a better job this year.

This year was really the best. This is a subcommittee which normally works very well. It is not a very partisan subcommittee. It has requests that overwhelm it. It tries to do the best it can for each of the petitioners at its bar.

This year, I think we had, however, the best meetings of this subcommittee, where we tried very hard to take into account the differences in the requests, the differences in the committee loads.

Again, I congratulate the chairman for his leadership in this regard.

I want to also restate, as one of the reasons why I am supporting this amendment, the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], who indicated that this resolution is, indeed, a small amount less than the amounts that we expended in 1985. Therefore, it takes us back more than 2 years. Remember, we are talking about 1987 dollars, and so, in fact, we have had a good deal less than a current service budget for the committee.

Now, reverting to my normal curmudgeonly style, I would say that there is no committee of this House that could not operate with less.

□ 1140

Were I king, I would see that they did operate with less. Nevertheless, I think we have made the best of what is before us, and I am particularly pleased with the allocation between the committees, where the subcommittee worked very hard, particularly with some thorny problems that relate to the Committee on Armed Services and some equally thorny problems relating to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, where we were able at the last minute to convert some resources to that committee in recognition of the particular burdens they were bearing.

I also want to invite the attention of the House to the fact that this \$47,900,000 figure represents only a fraction of what we spend on our committees. We should remember that each of the standing committees has a statutory staff as well, so instead of this being \$47 million, the total cost for all of our committees is going to be above \$90 million. Each standing committee has a statutory staff of 30 people, which normally averages out to be about a million and a half dollars in each payroll for each committee.

So when the Members look through the list that has been provided to them and see that the Energy and Commerce Committee is the grand champion spender with \$4.6 million, they should remember that it also has another \$1.6 million, so it is actually spending in excess of \$6 million.

However, they should not accuse it of being the champion spender because not included in this resolution is the amount of money required to fund the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee, both of which have a direct draw on the contingency fund. Actually the largest creditor is the Appropriations Committee, with over \$8 million of expenditures, particularly due to the fact that it has what is called associate staff, that is, staff members allocable to the committee members themselves and not serving the whole committee. That is one of the problems we face.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHROEDER). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] has expired.

Mr. BADHAM. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

Mr. FRENZEL. Madam Speaker, another problem we have is the section 5(d) rule which provides that vice chairmen of committees and chairmen be allocated certain staff slots. This has been a very hard one for the committee to work with. The proliferation of subcommittees has expanded that particular rule to a point where it is almost an intolerable burden for us to bear. I have often recommended that that rule be changed. Until it is, we are fighting an element which is almost beyond our control.

To summarize, Madam Speaker, the committee has done as good a job as could be done. I wish it were more money, but in recognition of a particularly distinguished job, I am going to vote for the resolution and I urge all Members to do so.

Mr. GAYDOS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 108, the committee funding resolution for 1987.

At the outset I, too, would like to commend and thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS] and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] and the members of the Subcommittee on Accounts. The task before them is a difficult one and entails long, arduous hours of deliberations. That task is made even more difficult by the overriding desire to reduce budget deficits, yet at the same time to provide adequate funds for the committees of the House to discharge the responsibilities mandated to them effectively and wisely.

Madam Speaker, the area of foreign affairs has not always been a popular one. However, the work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is as important to the national interests as is the work of any department or agency of the executive branch. As I stated in my justification before the Subcommittee on Accounts, while we are not charged with funding the Armed Forces, we are responsible for the funding of and oversight over the departments and agencies of the Government whose major responsibilities are to formulate and execute those policies and programs that insure that war does not occur. This is a fact that is too often overlooked.

In addition, several developments in the international arena have combined to increase the responsibility and workload of our committee. In particular, the issues of arms control, international terrorism, the war on illegal drugs, and recently, the international impact of the dreaded acquired deficiency syndrome have moved center stage and are of primary concern to the American people.

I am grateful to the Committee on House Administration for its efforts to restore the funds cut in 1986. Those cuts resulted in a sharp curtailment of committee operations last year, particularly during the first fiscal period when it was necessary to suspend, among other things, domestic travel and witness expense, to cancel computer equipment, and to furlough all employees 1 day each month for 5 months. However, I believe we were still able to achieve a record of accomplishments for which we can be proud.

Our budget for 1987 was developed very carefully and realistically in terms of supporting the committee's projected legislative and oversight activities and need for computer equipment, and was prepared in concert with the subcommittees and the minority. In this connection, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleague from Michigan, the ranking minority member, Mr. BROOMFIELD, for his invaluable input, cooperation, and support during the budget process.

In closing, I urge the Members of the House to support House Resolu-

tion 108, as reported from the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I am delighted to yield to the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee in support of House Resolution 108.

I would like to express my appreciation for the great work done by the House Administration Subcommittee on Accounts, chaired by Mr. GAYDOS the ranking minority member, Mr. BADHAM, for their understanding and support for the Foreign Affairs Committee budget request.

Each year, the members of the House Administration Committee have a very difficult task in considering and reviewing the budget requests of their colleagues, and I think they have done an excellent job of weighing the requests against the tight budgetary constraints.

I would particularly like to commend Chairman FASCELL for his outstanding support and cooperation for the minority's needs of the Foreign Affairs Committee. The chairman has concurred with the minority on the budget request which we presented to him, and he has been extremely fair in the allocation of resources to the committee Republicans.

This year will be a very busy year for the Foreign Affairs Committee, having before it a number of 2-year authorization bills, arms control issues, and legislative cleanup after the Iran-Contra investigation is completed. I think that the chairman's budget request for the Foreign Affairs Committee meets our needs to successfully fulfill the committee's obligations and responsibilities.

Chairman FASCELL and I stand together on our committee budget and we ask our colleagues to support our request.

Mr. BADHAM. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER].

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution.

Last year I believe that the Committee on House Administration and the House as a whole did a good job in responding to the Gramm-Rudman dic-

tates in tightening up committee funding procedures. I am afraid that the loosening of the purse strings this year has been a little too large, witness some of the activities which have already gone on in the Committee on the Judiciary.

On February 13, 1986, the then staff director of the Committee on the Judiciary, Garner J. Cline, issued a memorandum to subcommittee counsel informing them, among other things, that in order to meet the Gramm-Rudman reduction, "effective immediately no domestic travel will be approved for Members or staff, and no approval will be granted for reimbursement of witnesses' expenses. All witnesses are to be advised in advance that they must pay their own travel and other expenses."

Madam Speaker, the full text of the subcommittee staff memorandum is as follows:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, February 13, 1986.

To: Subcommittee Counsel.

From: Garner J. Cline, Staff Director.

The Judiciary Committee's appropriation for 1986 has been cut as a result of the Gramm-Rudman amendment and our Committee activities will have to be modified accordingly.

The first segment of our appropriation—covering the period from January 3 to October 1, 1986—represents a 10.07% cut over last year's funding.

In order to meet this reduction, effective immediately no domestic travel will be approved for Members or staff, and no approval will be granted for reimbursement of witnesses' expenses. All witnesses are to be advised in advance that they must pay their own travel and other expenses.

Some cuts may be required in other categories of the budget in order for the Committee to stay within the new spending restriction.

I urge the cooperation of the Subcommittee staffs in the effort to carry out the work of the Committee this Session within the budget limitations placed on us.

Apparently, Madam Speaker, this memorandum has not been countermanded, but the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights headed by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS], has already started on a spending spree for witness expenses.

At hearings that were held last month on alleged FBI break-ins relating to movements opposed to the administration's Central American policy, over \$2,000 in witness expenses was sent to four selected witnesses

who came to testify before the subcommittee. One of those witnesses, Mr. Frank Varelli, told the subcommittee that the organizations that were being investigated were being investigated for political purposes. However, on cross-examination he admitted that just last year he had been trying to peddle information to the John Birch Society that subversive elements were infiltrating the FBI and were affecting their activities. So much for Mr. Varelli's credibility.

□ 1150

Yet he was paid \$410 to come to Washington to put on this spectacle. Furthermore, he brought along his attorney, Douglas Larson, who was paid \$497.75 to promote the lawsuit that he had filed against the U.S. Government on Mr. Varelli's behalf.

It seems to me that the original edict of the staff director of the Committee on Judiciary was in the taxpayers' best interests and in the best interests of preventing the taxpayers funds from being used to promote media events. That has not been the case and that is one of the reasons why I believe that the committee allocation, at least insofar as the Judiciary Committee, is a little bit too high.

Furthermore, another one of the selected witnesses who got their travel expenses paid was a Rev. Donovan Cook from Seattle, WA. The Reverend Cook had been able to scrape together the money to make frequent trips to El Salvador since 1983, but nonetheless was not able, apparently, to pay for his own way here.

I think that this is an example of what happens when there is too much of an allocation for committee expenses. We will be seeing expenses paid to witnesses for media events to promote a certain philosophy and those expenses will be paid only for selected witnesses that might comport with the committee chairman's viewpoint.

I believe that the Committee on House Administration ought to get this resolution back to redo it so that we can continue running the committees on a tight ship rather than wasting the taxpayers' money as I have just described.

Madam Speaker, I would like to include the report of travel authorized by the Committee on the Judiciary for this hearing.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, REPORT OF TRAVEL AUTHORIZED, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

| Traveler | Dates of travel | | Purpose of trip | Itinerary | Estimated cost | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|---------|---|---|----------------|---------|----------------|----------|
| | From | To | | | Per diem | Other | Transportation | Total |
| Donovan Cook | Feb. 17 | Feb. 20 | Attend subcommittee hearings on break-ins at organizations opposing U.S. Central American policy. | Seattle to Washington, DC, and return | \$100 | \$89.37 | \$346 | \$535.37 |
| Gustav Schultz | Feb. 18 | do | do | San Francisco to Washington, DC, and return | 100 | 54.95 | 587 | 741.95 |
| Frank Varelli | Feb. 19 | do | do | Dallas to Washington, DC, and return | 100 | | 310 | 410.00 |
| Douglas Larson | do | do | do | do | 100 | 87.75 | 310 | 497.75 |

Mr. GAYDOS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I think the House Administration Committee did a very good job.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] spoke about some witnesses that came to hearings of the subcommittee that I chair; one from Seattle, one from San Francisco and two from Dallas. The real problem is that the gentleman from Wisconsin really does not like oversight, especially of the FBI.

He expressed concern that we spent about \$2,000 to hold 2 days of hearings on what seems to be a pattern of politically motivated break-ins across the country, including charges that FBI agents themselves carried out unauthorized break-ins. This was not the first time one of the witnesses mentioned by the gentleman, Mr. Varelli, a former FBI informant, was flown to Washington at taxpayers' expense. In 1983, the FBI paid to fly him to Washington; he spoke at an FBI conference and gave tips on how to infiltrate organizations which he now says were peaceful groups. How much did that cost?

We learned at our hearing that the FBI paid this individual with taxpayers' money to compile a terrorist photograph album, which he did, including entries on nuns and Senators and Members of this House of Representatives. Now, how much did that cost, Madam Speaker?

Our hearings lasted 2 days. We had 14 witnesses, 9 of whom came from out of town. We reimbursed four of them for travel expenses. We had an obligation to pursue these issues, and I think that despite what the gentleman says, the taxpayers' money was very well spent.

Mr. BADHAM. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution and since the rules do not permit any debate in connection with a motion to recommit, which I intend to offer at the appropriate time, I will address my comments to that motion to recommit.

Over the years, this annual exercise in authorizing and appropriating money for investigative staff has evolved in a certain way. It has evolved in a way so as to protect the tender tentacles of the innards of this institution. By that I mean 4 or 5 years ago we used to see the resolution for each committee on the floor standing alone. Then we could examine whether or not the amount that would

be appropriated was fair and vote up or down.

Would you believe the unbelievable? We actually beat a few a few years ago. Then the powers that be went back to the drawing board and they said, "Well, now, we cannot tolerate this; we will bring it to the floor under a procedure where they will not have to stand singly. We will put them all in one lump;" which is what we have today.

They also have structured the rule in another interesting way so as to protect the tender innards of this institution; they have brought it under a procedure whereby nobody can offer an amendment. Now, is that not interesting? Some of us believe that we are in an era that is considering the \$200 billion-plus Federal deficit; that we should be authorizing no more than what was spent last year. I happen to be of that opinion. But the way this matter is structured, no one can offer an amendment.

We still have a few rights in the minority around this place. The majority has not yet denied us the ability to offer a motion to recommit, and that is what I intend to offer.

My motion to recommit will not freeze; it will actually permit an increase of expenditure of 6.7 percent over what was spent in calendar year 1986. I think that is most reasonable. That is actually more than we authorized for the Federal workers in terms of their COLA, 3 percent, and Social Security recipients of 1.3 and I believe that if this resolution is approved in the manner that is before us, Members, we should be aware that spending could rise in calendar year 1987 by 16.3 percent over what was spent in 1986.

The authorization level is an increase of 8.9, but if we approve it, the spending could actually go up by 16.3 and I believe that is unreasonable.

Mr. GAYDOS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the House committee funding authorization, House Resolution 108. This resolution strikes the proper balance between the legitimate funding needs of the committees and the overall need for fiscal restraint.

I am, of course, most familiar with those portions of the resolution which affect the Committee on Ways and Means. Because Ways and Means had always been frugal in the expenditures of public funds, we have maintained a major committee operation on a relatively low aggregate budget. We on the Committee on Ways and Means are proud of this record and, I would point out, our budget requests have always been made on a bipartisan basis. The Committee on Ways and Means' re-

quests to the Committee on House Administration reflected our judgment for the minimum amount necessary for Ways and Means to be responsive to the broad-ranging issues within our diverse jurisdiction.

The Ways and Means Committee's 1987 budget, like the resolution itself, must be compared to the 1985 budget in order to provide a proper perspective on the growth of the budget. The Ways and Means Committee's 1987 budget will represent an increase of 4 percent on an annual basis in comparison to 1985. On an overall basis, this resolution now before us provides less funds than were provided in 1985.

Madam Speaker, last year's funding resolution inflicted severe limitations on all of the committees in the House. The resolution before us today provides the funds that are necessary to enable us to properly run the committees of the House and fulfill our legislative obligations in the 100th Congress.

Madam Speaker, I certainly endorse what my good friends on the House Administration Committee have done, particularly Mr. GAYDOS, the subcommittee chairman. I realize that this is not an easy task. In order for us to continue to function and properly represent the legislative branch of Government costs money. I just hope that the adoption of this resolution and the vote by which it will pass is a tribute to the members of that committee.

□ 1200

Mr. BADHAM. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, when it comes to being generous to ourselves, that generosity knows no bounds. Yesterday we spent \$890 million in pork barrel. That means that 44 States will not even get as much as they got in 1988 for highways because we took care of ourselves first.

Today we have a committee funding resolution before us and here because all of the money goes to ourselves, guess what, we are going to increase the spending. We are going to increase it by \$4 million.

Now, what does \$4 million mean? We talk about millions of dollars around here like it is water going over Niagara Falls.

Now, \$4 million is the equal of about 1,300 American working families paying every dime in taxes just to fund our increased spending. Think about that, 1,300 working families are going to pay every dime of taxes this year just to fund the increased spending on our committees in this body, and what are they going to buy? We have already got staff tripping over

staff in a lot of these committees. We have got so much staff that we have run out of rooms on Capitol Hill to house them, so we have had to go off Capitol Hill and find buildings off Capitol Hill to put the staff in and we are asking the American people to go even further and for 1,300 families to do nothing but pay taxes so that we can have all this increase.

I suggest that is wrong. I suggest we at least should have been given the opportunity to offer amendments on this floor to try to cut back on some of that increase.

I think it is an appalling episode when you cannot even look at this bill and suggest that there are places to be cut and that the House ought to vote on amendments. It tells you something about just how closed we have come around here when 1,300 American working families are going to pay every dime in taxes to increase our funding, and yet we cannot even say, "Enough is enough." These are times that demand frugality. This is not a frugal resolution in my opinion. It should be defeated and reworked.

I thank the gentleman again for yielding this time.

Mr. GAYDOS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 108, the committee funding resolution. In particular, I want to applaud the fine work of the Committee on House Administration, its distinguished chairman, Mr. ANNUNZIO, the Subcommittee on Accounts, and its distinguished chairman, Mr. GAYDOS.

They have wrestled diligently with a challenging and difficult task. The result has been reasonable and fair to all concerned. I commend them for their work, and thank them for their cooperation.

Mr. BADHAM. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

I, too, had prepared an amendment for this and being a freshman, I did not realize that you cannot get there from here because of the rules that are put on it, but I do oppose this resolution.

We are spending money we simply do not have. It had to stop somewhere. If it does not stop under our own roof in our own budget, where can it stop? How can we expect anybody else to pull in their belts if we are not willing to.

I cannot believe what I have heard here this morning. I cannot believe that we talk about a budget of \$47 million for the investigative functions of our committee and we talk about it as if it is a lean and mean kind of budget, that we are really tucking it in and we

act like we were really put upon last year because we did not have all the money we thought we should have had. We talk about a budget that is over twice the rate of inflation, a budget increase that is over twice the rate of inflation as if we are really being fiscally conservative. This is an increase I do not think we can afford at a time when the Budget Committee is about to recommend that we renege on our promise to eliminate the budget deficit by 1991. This is something we cannot afford when the Government is borrowing over 10 cents of every dollar it spends. This is something we cannot afford at a time when we are going to be forced to ask our constituents to tighten their belts to pay for our fiscal irresponsibility.

How can we ask the agencies to conserve the way we are asking them to conserve when we spend almost 9 percent over what we had last year?

I know that the committee considered very carefully the priorities and I commend them for that. I would not presume to tell them what the priorities ought to be, but what I would like to see is a freeze.

Madam Speaker, if there is a motion to recommit, I would support that; if not, I would hope we would defeat the resolution.

Mr. BADHAM. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], a member of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would like to compliment the subcommittee chairman and the ranking member and all members of the subcommittee. This is always a very difficult committee. It is extremely difficult when we try to make decisions in today's context.

In listening to my various colleagues in terms of their concerns about the committee funding budget that we have put together this year, let me give you a couple ideas about decisions that were in front of us as we were making our decisions.

The gentleman from Wisconsin said that the Judiciary Committee was a little bit too high. I agreed with him. I thought it should have been cut. Over half a million dollars was cut out of the Judiciary budget. It was a little bit too high, but as you go through and say that one committee was maybe a little bit too low, I happen to think the Interior Committee was a committee that was a little bit too low; another one was a little bit too high and another one was a little bit too low. What you have to do is ask yourselves in toto, is it reasonable? Is it appropriate? I think the answer is "yes."

The gentleman from California indicated that what he wanted to do shortly was to provide a motion to recommit and he complained here in the

well about the fact that he was not able to vote on each and every committee.

I have examined his motion to recommit and what he asks us to do is look at the committees in toto. He does not provide specific structuring of committees in his motion to recommit. He takes the same approach that the committee is offering the body today.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of California. I do not have very much time, may I say to the gentleman.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania indicates that his conscience will not let us deal with this. I think if the gentleman will examine the Budget Committees of 10 years ago, we have done a remarkable job of trying to hold the line.

Have we held the line? No.

Have we done a pretty good job of holding the line? The answer is "yes."

If you will examine what this committee is doing today and combine it with last year's budget and plug in inflation, I think you will find that the total dollars available after adjustment for inflation is less than last year.

I just left a Budget Committee meeting and I will tell the gentleman from Colorado that if we could do in the Budget Committee for the Federal budget what we have done with this particular budget from last year to this year, would we applaud? Absolutely.

I would ask my colleagues to examine each and every committee and then consider it in toto. Is it reasonable? Is it appropriate?

I think if you examine it in toto, I think you will find that the answer is "yes."

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I will point out to my colleague that I would have been inclined to pursue the policy that he has described of being specific with respect to certain committees that I think are in excess of what they should be receiving, but the moment my motion to recommit would contain that kind of specificity, the Parliamentarian up there at the desk would object that I have gone too far in drafting my motion to recommit.

I mention this because I think that it is another illustration of how the institution is preventing as much as it can any effort to deal effectively with reducing any particular committee, giving us only an up-or-down vote on the whole issue.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Madam Speaker, I think that if the gentleman would examine each and every com-

mittee in terms of the adjustments that were made, although some Members have made the argument that it is approximately a 9-percent—an 8.9-percent—increase, and there was a reduction last year—a 9.3-percent reduction—that it basically is a restitution.

I think that really is a superficial examination of the decisions that were made in the subcommittee and accepted by the committee. I think that we will find that each and every committee was examined on its individual merits or demerits, and adjustments were made. Some committees got absolutely no increase from last year; other committees got over an 18-percent increase. Why? Because we felt that the requests were justified. We went through and looked at each and every committee and made the decision.

The appropriations are in a total amount distributed among committees.

Once again I would ask Members of this body to examine our effort and support it.

Mr. GAYDOS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHROEDER). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS] has 6 minutes remaining and the gentleman from California [Mr. BADHAM] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Madam Speaker, I wish to express my support of House Resolution 108, which provides funding for the standing and select committees in the House, including the Committee on Agriculture. The Subcommittee on Accounts and the Committee on House Administration have developed a reasonable funding authorization which is only \$3,928,849 over the 1986 authorization and is \$105,772 less than the total authorization for 1985.

It is essential that the committees of the House are provided with sufficient funds to carry out their legislative and oversight responsibilities. A review of the agendas proposed by the committees for this year indicates that this will be one of our busiest sessions and there are critical and complex issues which must be dealt with by the committees. We all sustained reductions in funding in 1986; it is therefore essential that we have adequate resources to enable us to meet our responsibilities during this session.

The Committee on Agriculture, throughout its history, has prudently administered its funding and will continue to do so. We remain one of the lowest funded standing committees of the House despite our extensive and complex jurisdictional obligations. The majority and minority members of our committee have traditionally worked together in the interests of effectively meeting our responsibilities to the U.S. Congress and the people of this Nation.

The Committee on House Administration has cited us for our equitable distribution of resources and for our record of fiscal management. The committee will again be faced with a heavy workload during this difficult year of

continuing problems for American agriculture. I hope my colleagues will fully support House Resolution 108, which will enable us to do the work with which we have been entrusted.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 108 authorizing funds for the 1987 expenses of the committees of the House. House Resolution 108 contains \$548,321 for the Veterans' Affairs Committee. This amount essentially restores the cuts the committee was required to make in 1986 to comply with the Gramm-Rudman reductions imposed on all committees and to bring our funding back to the 1985 level. I regret the resolution does not contain the funds requested to fill four minority subcommittee slots on the committee as provided for under the rules of the House. We will try again next year.

Our budget is the third lowest of the standing committees, although we oversee one of the largest and most important agencies of the Federal Government, with 172 medical centers, 227 outpatient clinics, 189 readjustment counseling centers, 16 domiciliaries, 58 regional offices, and over 240,000 employees.

I want to bring to the Members' attention an important pilot project being conducted by our committee in cooperation with the Clerk of the House, the Committee on House Administration, the Joint Committee on Printing, House Information Systems, and the Government Printing Office to reduce congressional printing costs.

Although this project does not directly affect the resolution under consideration today, it has shown that the committees of Congress can save a tremendous amount of the taxpayers' money by drastically reducing congressional printing costs through computerized publishing applications. I recommend these new printing procedures to all committee chairmen.

Although the committee's request was reduced by \$143,000, I support the resolution and urge its adoption.

Mr. HAWKINS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 108, the omnibus primary expenses resolution.

With respect to funding for the Committee on Education and Labor, the amount provided in the resolution would simply restore the committee's resources to the 1985 level without including increases for inflation since 1985.

The reduction in 1986 funds necessitated substantial cutbacks in the committee's activities: Some staff positions were eliminated, vacancies were not filled, salaries were not adjusted for cost-of-living or merit, and many important trade and professional journals were canceled or not renewed because of lack of funds. Travel was virtually banned for the first 6 months of the year and was sharply restricted for the remainder of the year. In my view, the important and necessary oversight activities of the committee were adversely affected by the reduction in travel.

The committee's agenda for the first session is an extremely demanding one. We have already begun consideration of an omnibus elementary and secondary reauthorization which will entail extensive field hearings. We are also moving in response to the leadership directive to report out education, training, em-

ployment and worker readjustment as a part of the omnibus trade bill. In addition, the committee will address work and training aspects of welfare reform, reauthorizations of the Older Americans Act, and several workplace and labor related bills, including a review of the Davis-Bacon Act.

The amount requested in the funding resolution is the minimum needed to permit the committee to conduct its business during this session. I assure the House that the money provided the committee in this resolution will be wisely spent and properly disbursed.

Summary of committee budget follows:

COMMITTEE BUDGET 1987—SUMMARY

House Resolution 80 (cosponsored by Rep. Jeffords) provides a total of \$3,031,126 (Majority \$629,995; Minority \$629,995; eight Subcommittees at \$221,392—\$1,771,136).

Increase is 15% over last session's budget, which sequestration reduced by 9%. 1987 budget request is 5% less than requested in 1985.

(1) Salaries: Cost of living 3% for 1987. Virtually no raises in 1986. 1986: \$2,257,497; 1987: \$2,667,693; Increase \$410,196.

(2) Travel: Majority, Minority and Subcommittees all project significant increases in field hearings and investigations (ECIA reauthorization; oversight). 1986: \$76,660; 1987: \$153,338; Increase \$76,678.

(3) Equipment: Committee took advantage of one-time purchase plans out of 1986 funds, resulting in reduction in request. 1986: \$176,072; 1987: \$109,652, Decrease —\$66,420. (Note: total 1986 funds invested in one-time purchases: \$60,302.46).

(4) Witnesses: Need for testimony from sources unable to pay their way. Sequestration prevented expenditures for this purpose. 1986: \$359; 1987: \$11,500; Increase \$11,141.

(5) Consultants: Cheaper to use temporary expertise than hire permanent professional staff. Specific proposal in Attachment #3. 1986: \$196.50; 1987: \$2,500 (Murphy); Increase \$2,303.50.

(6) Publications: Need for appropriate professional publications to get up-to-date input on technology and developments. Numerous publications cancelled last year because of sequestration. 1986: \$36,854; 1987: \$47,595; Increase \$10,741.

(7) Phones: Over 4% increase in inflation indicates a modest increase needed for communication costs. 1986: \$13,199; 1987: \$17,520; Increase \$4,321.

(8) Unexpended Balance: \$63,734 (2.2%) being returned as of this date (including anticipated charges). Majority: \$13,816; Minority: \$27,621; Subcommittees \$21,297.

(9) Money apportioned in our Committee budget to Majority, Minority and Subcommittees. Unexpended balances for the various elements differ as a result.

(10) Sequestration: 9% reduction in 1986 funds resulted in curtailment in almost all areas of Committee activity—especially personnel, travel and publications.

(11) Staffing: As of January 3, 1987, there were 36 Majority employees (20 Standing, 16 Investigating, no interns).

Mr. BROOKS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 108, which will provide funding for the committees of the House for the 1st session of the 100th Congress. The resolution, as brought to the floor by the Committee on House Administration, is a prudent and carefully drawn measure that

will permit the committees to operate in an efficient and cost effective manner.

Madam Speaker, the committees of this House play the central role in the House's discharge of its responsibility for legislating and overseeing the activities and programs of the Federal Government. It is obvious that if we in the House are to fulfill our constitutional role, our committee structure must be provided with adequate resources to do the job.

Because of extreme budget restraints, committees of the House have operated over the past year with severely diminished funding resources. Through a spirit of cooperation and dedication on behalf of both the majority and minority, we have been able to function under these conditions without seriously impairing the quality of the work we produce. However, speaking as the chairman of the standing committee with primary oversight responsibilities, I think it will be difficult to continue successful operations interminably under these circumstances.

Some of the work done by the committees of the House can be delayed temporarily in order to save money in the short term. Hearings can be put off, legislation postponed, investigations carried over to a succeeding Congress, and so on. But, we cannot expect to go on like this forever without losing the comprehensiveness and continuity that is necessary to maintain successful operations of the legislative branch.

The funding level proposed for the committees in House Resolution 108 represents a modest increase over previous years' amounts. It does not provide for the full amount my committee had requested, but the Committee on House Administration has carefully analyzed the committees' budget requests and has come forward with a resolution that it feels will permit the committees to operate at an adequate funding level. In my view, House Resolution 108 represents the bare minimum of what we need to carry out our constitutional responsibilities in this body, and it deserves our support.

Mr. BADHAM. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. BADHAM] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BADHAM. Madam Speaker, I would just say to the Members that I support this resolution. It is not the world's most perfect resolution, but within the constraints and parameters with which we found ourselves, not due so much even to this year but to previous years' past actions, we found ourselves in a framework that pretty well tied us in.

This is basically a virtual no-growth-since-1985 resolution; in fact, there is a slight decline in constant dollars from 1985. I think that that is fair, because we did, over the years that I have been trying to on our side achieve cuts, we have done that, and now it is time to move ahead.

I would just like to say, because some committees were mentioned, that the committee on which I serve, the Committee on Armed Services, which is responsible for the oversight

of military activities of the United States throughout this world, to the tune of about \$300 billion a year—we have one of the smallest staffs of any standing committee, authorizing committee, in the House of Representatives. It is smaller than Banking, smaller than Education and Labor, smaller than Energy and Commerce, smaller than Foreign Affairs, smaller than Government Operations, Interior, Judiciary, Merchant Marine, even Public Works and Science and Technology.

The fact is that we seem to do a reasonably good job in that arena and in that area with a very small staff. We have had to have staff increases this year just to keep up with the mandates given by this body and by the other body of this Congress to talk about arms reduction, to talk about procurement reform, to talk about test-ban treaties and that sort of thing, and we have had to do that with an ever smaller and ever decreased staff.

This year has helped us through the efforts of this committee, and so I ask that this resolution be adopted, so that we might get together and get on with the work of the Congress of the United States.

Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GAYDOS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that as a practical matter, all we are doing is dividing up something that already has been authorized in the budget. I would not be so brash as to suggest at this time that the arguments being made here are too late in the wrong place. All we did as a committee—and I would invite any Member to join the committee—all we have done as committee members is take an item, voted on and authorized by our colleagues, and try to—using all the equitable methods at our disposal—to divide it up equally.

Committees being what they are and self-serving declarations and statements being rather prevalent in the area, I would suggest that it is very difficult at best to try to respond to a committee chairman who is in dire need after taking substantial—and I want to emphasize that—substantial cuts last year, and tell him that his needs and requests as submitted to us are unreasonable.

We had committee chairmen make staffs work 3 days a week. We had certain committees that fired people, personnel whom they had with them 15 and 18 years—fired them, and had to reduce their staffs, 14 and 15 in number.

I think that the committee as such has done an admirable job. For instance, this committee since 1980—and

this is a matter of statistics and not me speaking or puffing, but a matter of statistics—this committee since 1980 has increased each year this amount of money for these particular requests 1.27 percent. That is an 8.87-percent overall total in 7 years. Now if that is not frugality, I want to find it here somewhere. Do not forget that those figures should reflect and do reflect cost-of-living increases, additional burdens and investigations that we have had—I did not cause them.

I would like to, if it were humanly possible, have some of our Members here sit with us. It is a thankless job. We try to be as fair and equitable as we can.

Let me respond to the one accusation made by my real good friend from Pennsylvania—I do not want to take the time, but I have to respond. He was talking about staff inflation and what was happening—we have people running out of our ears, and all the people working on the Hill, no parking places and things like that. But look at the facts; just look at these facts.

I submit that there is no longer here an explosive staff growth as characterized in the mid-1970's and stemming from a variety of factors. We have right now here the staff figures that show a slowdown which occurred even before Congress enacted Gramm-Rudman. This is a matter of statistics. In 1979, for example, there were 2,027 staff for House standing, select, and special committees. At the end of 1984, before Gramm-Rudman, there were 1,919 such staff, for a 5.3-percent reduction.

Now those are facts, those are figures, those are not accusations drawn out of a hat. With the passage of Gramm-Rudman, this committee has been responsible, we have responded. Last year this committee without any explanation cut everybody 9 percent across the board, and our chairman and our committee suffered—a 9-percent cut. I tried in my opening remarks call the attention of my colleagues and make a specific point of the fact that we have October, November, and December which may be subjected to a possible sequestration order, as we did the year before, when we sent notices to all the committees and we suggested to them and told them that they had to cut back. This may occur this time also.

Madam Speaker, I want to conclude by saying that in good conscience and in due respect to my colleagues who serve on that committee, I, with every fiber in my body, state as a matter of record and in good conscience that I thought and I think that the committee did an excellent job by dividing up as equitably as possible all the money that had already been voted upon and doing such in such a manner that we had responses back—I would say in 95

percent of the cases—from the chairmen and those affected that they were completely in accord with what we had done under the existing circumstances.

I am going to ask my colleagues to support this in-house resolution, support it because it is fair and it is just under the circumstances.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAYDOS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 108, authorizing funding for the House standing and select committees for the 1st session of the 100th Congress.

I would like to point out to my colleagues, however, that while the standing committees received increases in their budgets, ranging from 5 percent for the Committee on the District of Columbia to nearly 21 percent for the Armed Services Committee, the select committees, consisting of the Committees on Aging, on Children, Youth and Families, on Hunger and on Narcotics Abuse and Control, received only a 3-percent increase in their budgets.

As the ranking minority member of the Narcotics Select Committee, I can assure my colleagues that the 3-percent increase puts the work of our select committee in a no-growth situation and comes at a time when the Congress and the President have enacted into law the Antidrug Abuse Act of 1986, which is one of the most far-reaching, and comprehensive antidrug measures to become law. This no-growth increase in our budget also comes at a time when we are conducting oversight hearings on the implementation of the legislative initiatives contained in the Antidrug Abuse Act.

In my view, the budgetary requests of select committees should be based on each select committee's budgetary merits rather than being treated identically with meager across-the-board increases.

Madam Speaker, I submit that to do otherwise is inequitable to the budgetary needs of each select committee and does not adequately serve the objectives that each select committee is trying to achieve.

□ 1220

Mr. GAYDOS. Madam Speaker, having said what I did in asking my colleagues to support the resolution, I move the previous question on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute and on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHROEDER). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. DANNEMEYER

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from California opposed to the resolution?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I am, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DANNEMEYER moves to recommit House Resolution 108 to the Committee on House Administration with instructions that they report such resolution back to the House authorizing funds for 1987 at levels not exceeding those authorized for 1986.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that she will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of the passage of the resolution.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 127, nays 268, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

YEAS—127

Archer
Army
Baker
Ballenger
Bartlett
Barton
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Boehlert
Boulter
Brown (CO)
Buechner
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Cheney
Coats
Coble
Combust
Conte
Coughlin
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
Daub
Davis (IL)
DeWine
DieGuardi

Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Early
Emerson
Fawell
Fields
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Grandy
Gregg
Gunderson
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hiler
Hopkins
Houghton
Hunter
Inhofe
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Kasich
Kolbe

Konnyu
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lott
Lukens, Donald
Lungren
Mack
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
McCandless
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison (WA)
Myers
Nielson
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan

Petri
Porter
Pursell
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Ritter
Rogers
Roth
Rowland (CT)
Saxton
Schaefer
Schneider
Schuette
Schulze

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
Badham
Barnard
Bateman
Bates
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilbray
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clarke
Clay
Clinger
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtner
Coyne
Crockett
Darden
Davis (MI)
DeFazio
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish

Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Skeen
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Denny
(OR)
Smith, Robert
(NH)
Smith, Robert
(OR)
Stump

NAYS—268

Flake
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Frenzel
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grant
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Hertel
Hochbrueckner
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson (SD)
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Klecza
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Lowry (WA)
Lukens, Thomas
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy

McDade
McGrath
McHugh
McKinney
McMillen (MD)
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinaro
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Panetta
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Pickett
Pickle
Price (IL)
Price (NC)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Richardson
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rostenkowski
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Sharp
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Solaz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers

Stallings
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres

Towns
Traficant
Udall
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weiss

Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Willson
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Wyllie
Yates
Yatron

NOT VOTING—38

Annunzio
AuCoin
Beilenson
Billey
Bonker
Chappell
Coleman (MO)
Collins
Daniel
de la Garza
DeLay
Edwards (OK)
Frost

Garcia
Gephardt
Gray (IL)
Harris
Holloway
Hubbard
Kemp
Lancaster
Livingston
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
McEwen

Nagle
Rose
Roukema
Saiki
Smith (FL)
Solomon
Stangeland
Stark
Tausin
Torricelli
Traxler
Young (AK)

□ 1240

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI and Mr. MACKEY changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHROEDER). The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FRENZEL. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 280, noes 117, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

AYES—280

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Badham
Barnard
Bateman
Bates
Bennett
Bentley
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilbray
Boehlert
Boggs
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell

Cardin
Chapman
Clarke
Clay
Clinger
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Courter
Coyne
Crockett
Darden
Davis (MI)
DeFazio
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
English
Erdreich
Espy

Evans
Fasell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Filippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Frenzel
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grant
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Hertel
Hochbrueckner
Horton

Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson (SD)
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Lott
Lowry (WA)
Lukens, Thomas
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McGrath
McHugh
McKinney
McMillen (MD)
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)

Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Morella
Morrison (CT)
Mrizek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Panetta
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Price (IL)
Price (NC)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Richardson
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Rostenkowski
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer

Sharp
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wortley
Wyden
Wyllie
Yates
Yatron

NOES—117

Archer
Arney
Baker
Ballenger
Bartlett
Barton
Bereuter
Billirakis
Boulter
Brown (CO)
Buechner
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Carper
Chandler
Cheney
Coats
Coble
Combest
Coughlin
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
Daub
Davis (IL)
DeWine
DioGuardi
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Early
Emerson
Fawell
Fields
Gallegly
Gallo

Gekas
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Grandy
Gregg
Gunderson
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hiler
Hopkins
Houghton
Hunter
Inhofe
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Kasich
Kolbe
Konnyu
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lukens, Donald
Lungren
Mack
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
McCandless
McCollum

McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Moorhead
Morrison (WA)
Nielsen
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Patterson
Petri
Pursell
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Ritter
Roemer
Rogers
Roth
Rowland (CT)
Saxton
Schaefer
Schuette
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (NE)
Smith, Denny
(OR)
Smith, Robert
(NH)
Smith, Robert
(OR)

Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall

Tauke
Upton
Walker
Weber

Weldon
Whittaker
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—36

Annunzio
Beilenson
Billey
Boland
Bonker
Chappell
Coleman (MO)
Collins
Daniel
de la Garza
DeLay
Edwards (OK)

Frost
Garcia
Gephardt
Gray (IL)
Harris
Holloway
Kemp
Lancaster
Lewis (CA)
Livingston
Lowery (CA)
Lujan

McEwen
Nagle
Ravenel
Rose
Roukema
Saiki
Stangeland
Stark
Tausin
Torricelli
Traxler
Young (AK)

□ 1250

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Lewis of California for, with Mr. Billey against.

Mr. McCOLLUM changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GAYDOS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHROEDER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AFGHANISTAN DAY

Mr. DYMALLY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 63) to designate March 21, 1987, as Afghanistan Day, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Madam Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 188, to designate March 21, 1987, as Afghanistan Day.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, as the sponsor of the House joint resolution commemorating March 21 as Afghanistan Day, I rise in

strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 63.

When the Soviets invaded over 7 years ago, little of the American public knew where Afghanistan was, much less the ramifications of this unprovoked attack. Today, the ongoing struggle of the Afghan people is a constant reminder to Americans and the world at large of the terrible cost of armed aggression.

This Congress has set aside March 21 to commemorate the heroic struggle of the Afghan people ever since Soviet divisions swept into Afghanistan, but time and the death and destruction caused by this unprovoked invasion have not stood still. This past year has witnessed an increase in the bloody military operations of the Soviets and their Afghan surrogates that have driven 3 million Afghans into exile. Last June, the European Parliament adopted a resolution condemning the slaughter of 1½ million Afghans since the invasion. In 1986, Soviet and Kabul regime aircraft violated Pakistan's airspace 757 times and inspired 233 terrorist incidents inside Pakistan.

Madam Speaker, 1986 also saw the deceptive withdrawal of six Soviet regiments, a "national reconciliation" scheme which leaves a regime opposed by an overwhelming majority of the Afghan people, and a cease-fire proposal with no provision for the withdrawal of the remaining troops numbering over 100,000.

The depth of this House's solidarity with the Afghan people is evident in the strong support of the leadership in bringing this resolution up in this expedited manner. I would like to thank my colleague from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and a strong supporter of a free Afghanistan, for his assistance and lead sponsorship. I would also like to thank Chairman DYMALLY and his staff for their great assistance in bringing this resolution to the floor today.

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Madam Speaker, as a cosponsor I strongly support this resolution commemorating March 21 as Afghanistan Day. The Afghan people have faced more than 7 long years of Soviet military occupation. Our country has been blessed with over 120 years of domestic peace. We can scarcely imagine the untold suffering and hardships which are a daily part of the lives of a people existing under a military occupation.

The statistics which accompany this brutal invasion are staggering. Close to one-third of the entire population has been forced to flee the country. The majority of these refugees are now in Pakistan where they are placing an incredible burden on an already

strained economy. The Soviets, in attempts to crush Afghan resistance, have resorted to unconscionable military tactics. This includes the reported use of chemical weapons, deliberate destruction of crops and livestock and state-sponsored terrorism which have combined to leave over a million dead.

Today, I urge your support in adopting this resolution to recognize the ongoing struggle of freedom from oppression of the Afghan people. We must stand resolved that the principles of self-determination and respect for the rights of mankind will not be forgotten. Let us hope that with each gesture of disapproval the Soviet Union will move that much closer to a complete withdrawal of its armies and the acceptance of the sovereign integrity of the Afghan people.

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 63, calling upon the President to issue a proclamation designating March 21, 1987, as "Afghanistan Day."

We cannot ignore the Soviet military occupation of Afghanistan and we must keep alive the public interest since the Afghan situation is no longer receiving the media coverage it deserves.

We must demonstrate over and over again the nature and extent of Soviet crimes in Afghanistan. As the leader of the free world, the United States is expected to pursue a policy of firmness against Soviet imperialism. This is one case where we can be certain that all countries of the free world will respect our leadership, especially those people who share the Muslim religion which is being suppressed by Soviets in Afghanistan.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. Res 63

Whereas more than seven years have passed since the unprovoked Soviet invasion of the nonaligned country of Afghanistan;

Whereas close to one hundred and fifteen thousand Soviet troops are continuing a brutal attempt to crush the nationwide Afghan resistance to the Soviets and the Marxist regime they installed;

Whereas indiscriminate air and artillery bombardments, deliberate attempts to generate refugees, and the destruction of livestock, crops, and property remain a key instrument of Soviet and Kabul regime policy;

Whereas Soviet and Kabul regime actions in Afghanistan violate the following international covenants: the 1949 Geneva Conventions and Customary International Law; article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; and the 1954 Hague Convention;

Whereas the military operations of the Soviets and their Afghan surrogates have

driven almost three million refugees into Pakistan, placing an almost intolerable burden on its economy, social service system, and ecology;

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly has in eight resolutions called for the "immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan", and a recent United Nations Human Rights Commission report concludes that the continuation of a military solution in Afghanistan will "lead inevitably to a situation approaching genocide";

Whereas, the twentieth semiannual report of the United States Department of State on the implementation of the Helsinki Final Act observes that Soviet policies in Afghanistan are: "in direct and willful violation of the general principles set forth in the Helsinki Final Act, including respect of the inviolability of frontiers, territorial integrity of states, and self-determination of peoples";

Whereas, in June 1986, the European Parliament overwhelmingly adopted a resolution on the situation in Afghanistan which condemns: "The deaths of some one and a half million Afghans since the beginning of the Soviet intervention, out of the total population of fifteen million, while four and a half million refugees have had to flee to Pakistan and Iran and a million Afghans are surviving in extremely difficult conditions within the country itself";

Whereas Soviet and Kabul regime aircraft have violated Pakistan's airspace seven hundred and fifty-seven times during 1986, killing forty-six innocent people and wounding seventy-seven;

Whereas over two hundred and thirty-three Soviet and Kabul-inspired terrorist incidents took place in Pakistan during 1986, often in circumstances calculated to cause the deaths of innocent civilians;

Whereas recent developments such as the deceptive withdrawal of six Soviet regiments, a "national reconciliation" scheme which leaves a regime opposed by an overwhelming majority of the Afghan people, and a ceasefire proposal with no provision for the withdrawal of Soviet forces suggest no change in the Soviet goal in Afghanistan;

Whereas the only credible indicator of Soviet commitment to negotiated political settlement in Afghanistan will be their agreement at the Geneva negotiations to a prompt and complete withdrawal of all their troops and full self-determination for the Afghan people;

Whereas, since the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the Congress has in numerous resolutions declared the solidarity of the American people with the struggle of the Afghan people against the Soviet invaders; and

Whereas the people of Afghanistan observe March 21 as the traditional start of their new year and as a symbol of their nation's rebirth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating March 21, 1987, as Afghanistan Day, and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ENERGY EDUCATION DAY

Mr. DYMALLY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 19) to designate March 20, 1987 as "National Energy Education Day," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

□ 1300

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHROEDER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, and I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 19, designating March 20, 1987, as "National Energy Education Day."

As a member of the House Subcommittee on Energy Research and Production, I have become acutely aware of the importance of supporting and maintaining an economical energy policy.

By designating March 20, 1987, as National Energy Education Day we can bring to the attention of the American people a deeper and meaningful understanding of our energy needs. It will afford an opportunity to our educators and community leaders to focus attention on our energy needs and issues not only in today's society, but will help shape our attitude toward energy policy in the future. A reliable and economical supply of energy is essential to the well-being of all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S. J. Res. 19

Whereas a reliable and economical supply of energy is essential to the future well-being of the United States;

Whereas the development and implementation of an enlightened energy policy requires that the public be adequately informed of the issues and alternatives;

Whereas ongoing quality energy education programs in America's schools and communities will continue to play an important role in educating the public regarding energy issues;

Whereas the annual celebration of "National Energy Education Day" (NEED) brings together students, teachers, school officials, and community leaders to focus attention on the need for energy education in our Nation's schools and communities; and

Whereas such a celebration should be conducted in a manner which encourages a deeper understanding of the energy changes and challenges that have and will continue

to shape America's future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to promote and enhance energy education programs at all grade levels of public and private schools throughout the United States, March 20, 1987, is designated National Energy Education Day". The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States, and all educational institutions, to observe such a day with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and encourage appropriate Federal agencies to participate in the observance of such a day and to cooperate with persons and institutions conducting such ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DYMALLY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate joint resolutions just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 39

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 39. I have approval of the Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Mr. UDALL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

A PRESCRIPTION FOR PREVENTING TEEN PREGNANCY

(Mr. COATS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COATS. Madam Speaker, I commend to my colleagues today an article written in the Washington Post by Eunice Kennedy Shriver, who is executive vice president of the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation, which works in and has major programs in mental retardation and adolescent pregnancy. I quote from that article as follows:

To transform our schools into contraceptive dispensaries is to give a strong message that sex in adolescence is okay, that it is an approved extracurricular activity. "Do what you please but do be careful" is the message we would be sending.

Mrs. Shriver goes on to eloquently and forcefully speak against the programs of simply establishing school-

based health clinics as a means of preventing teenage pregnancy, indicating that we must look at the much broader question. I quote from the article again, as follows:

Adolescent needs will be fulfilled only when we begin to understand that teen-age pregnancy concerns the whole person, the family, the community and the society, not just the sexual act of the individual at risk. It involves moral and ethical issues, not simply mechanical solutions. It requires, above all, communities that care.

Madam Speaker, there is a great deal to listen to in this article, entitled "Rx for Teen Pregnancy," which appeared in today's Washington Post. I trust my colleagues will look it up in today's Washington Post.

CONGRESS SHOULD DEFEAT HOUSE RESOLUTION 108

(Mr. INHOFE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INHOFE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to House Resolution 108, a bill being considered by the House today to provide for funding of the 25 committees of the House of Representatives, and proposed tax increases as advocated by the Speaker of the House.

At this time of massive Federal budget deficits—fiscal year 1987 deficit exceeded \$220 billion—you would think that Congress would subject itself to some degree of budgetary restraint in order to do its part to control the deficit. While this would be a logical assumption, it is far from the truth.

The legislation before the House today would increase funding for all 25 House committees and the House Information Systems [HIS] for fiscal year 1987. The resolution would increase spending on House committees from a total of \$44 million in 1986 to over \$47.9 million in 1987. This represents a 9-percent increase—well over last year's funding and—well over last year's inflation rate of 1.4 percent. Last year's rate was the lowest in 25 years. This funding covers only investigative costs of the committees and does not take into account the additional money that will be required to hire staff, pay for travel, and various other expenses.

I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution and let the American people know that Congress is willing to subject itself to necessary budget restraint in order to control the Federal deficit.

On another matter, I am appalled at the recent remarks made by the Speaker of the House in favor of raising taxes by \$20 billion for 1988 and ignoring the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction targets. A March 5 article that appeared in the Washington Post

highlighted the Speaker's proposal to tax stock market transactions that would raise as much as \$17 billion a year. The Speaker also indicated that he supports deferring tax cuts to certain individuals as another way to raise additional revenues to reduce the deficit.

A week before the Speaker made his statement on raising taxes, the two Budget Committee chairmen of Congress had announced that they had no intention of drafting budgets that would be in accord with the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction target of \$108 billion for 1988. The chairmen have concluded that a \$108 billion deficit for fiscal year 1988 is not enough for them. They believe Congress should abandon the Gramm-Rudman target and are proposing to perpetuate the shameful and fiscally irresponsible budgets that have been produced by the Democratic leaders of this body in the past.

I, wholeheartedly reject their views, and I will oppose their efforts to force higher taxes on the American people as a way to reduce the deficit. The problem is not that we do not pay enough taxes—the problem is that Congress is out of control and cannot quench its insatiable desire to spend more money.

In contrast, I support and urge my colleagues to support the resolution that was passed by the House Republican Conference yesterday to mandate that Congress remain fully committed to the Gramm-Rudman target for a balanced budget by fiscal year 1991. I will oppose any attempt to deviate from this target and will instead focus my energy on ways to reduce spending and control the deficit without forcing new and unnecessary taxes on the American people.

Congress can and must do better to produce a responsible budget and stop spending money that we do not have. The American people have elected us to make the tough decisions and control excessive budget expenditures without taking the easy way out by simply increasing taxes. If we fail, serious economic consequences will result and threaten the survival of this great Nation.

I urge Members to join with me in opposing any new tax increase and work instead to pass a budget that falls within the realistic targets of the Gramm-Rudman Deficit Control Act. The future of our Nation depends upon the responsible action of Congress.

NATIONAL SPACE GRANT COLLEGE AND FELLOWSHIP ACT OF 1987

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing along with Senator BENTSEN the Space Grant College and Fellowship Act of 1987, an act to increase the momentum in our Nation's space science and research programs.

Our national space program has fallen on hard times. Meanwhile, the Soviets, the Japanese, and the Europeans are moving forward aggressively in space development. For example, the Europeans are spending 10 to 15 times more than the United States on microgravity research.

If these conditions persist, we will assuredly fall behind in developing the potential of outer space. We must not let that happen.

To put America back in the lead, we must help our universities focus on space research. Under NASA's direction, this program will do just that by investing seed money, matched by State and private funds, in research programs at our universities. The bill is based on the successful land-grant college system of 1862 and the sea-grant program.

It is my belief that this legislation will energize space research and commercialization by fostering public-private partnerships. By harnessing our best researchers to the challenges we face, our Nation can assure itself the lead in space into the next century.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. Just as the 37th Congress in 1862 had the foresight to pass the Land-Grant College Act that helped Americans develop the Western frontier, now let us establish space colleges to help us pioneer the space frontier.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO EFFECT CERTAIN HABEAS CORPUS REFORMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUNGREN. Madam Speaker, in 1969, an Iowa jury convicted Robert Anthony Williams of raping and murdering a 10-year-old girl in the city of Des Moines. Following his trial, Mr. Williams began a remarkable judicial odyssey that illustrates the urgent need for criminal justice reform that takes lawbreakers as seriously as they take their assaults on the law-abiding citizens of our country.

Mr. Williams first appealed his conviction to the Iowa Supreme Court. That tribunal upheld the jury's decision. Mr. Williams' petition for review was denied by the U.S. Supreme Court. He then turned to the Federal district court, alleging that his conviction violated his constitutional rights. The judge agreed with his claim and ordered him to be retried without the use of evidence that had led police to the victim's body. The State of Iowa

appealed the case to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals which upheld the district court ruling. The State then brought the case back before the U.S. Supreme Court which held that, although Williams had been advised of his Miranda rights five times, statements made to him by the detective out of the presence of counsel violated Williams' right to counsel. As a result, it was ordered that Williams would have to be retried.

Williams was retried in Iowa and a jury of his peers convicted him again. Williams subsequently took his case back to the Iowa Supreme Court, the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals and finally the U.S. Supreme Court. The Supreme Court concluded that the "inevitable discovery" rule—a rule stating that the evidence would have been discovered independent of the statement of the defendant—applied in this case. The Supreme Court thus upheld his conviction.

Madam Speaker, it strikes me as obscene that it has taken 17 years for our judicial system to end the agony of the family of the murdered girl. Imagine 17 years of uncertainty and pain suffered by an innocent family! It is even more obscene that extended delays in the administration of justice occur frequently in our legal system. Remarkably, over 8,000 habeas corpus petitions—petitions asking a court to rule on the legality of one's detention or imprisonment—are filed each year in Federal district courts. According to a 1984 report by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, more than 30 percent of State prisoner habeas corpus petitions filed in Federal courts were filed by persons who had filed one or more previous Federal habeas corpus petitions. And more than 26 percent of all habeas corpus court decisions are themselves appealed. Worst of all, empirical studies indicate that only 3 percent of all habeas petitions result in any form of relief.

Madam Speaker, we know that most crimes are not followed by arrest and conviction. Yet when arrest and conviction do occur, there is the perception that the law allows for an endless stream of appellate and collateral review. This view, as much as any other factor, has the effect of undermining public confidence in the criminal justice system. For the sake of that confidence, for the sake of a grossly overburdened judicial system, and for the sake of the families of victims of crime who anxiously await the resolution of the personal tragedies engendered by crime, it's high time that we brought our habeas corpus statutes into the 20th century. To accomplish that end, I have once again introduced legislation—H.R. 1333—that would have the effect of eliminating the excessive features of current habeas corpus law while yet retaining

the historical purpose of the "Great Wit."

My bill would establish a 1-year statute of limitations period for the filing of petitions by State prisoners, which would run from the time of exhaustion of State remedies. Exception to this statute of limitations could arise where State action violated Federal law, or where the habeas petition is grounded in a subsequently recognized Federal right, or in the existence of new facts.

In addition, the bill would vest in appellate court judges the authority to issue certificates of probable cause for appeal in habeas corpus proceedings. It would allow a Federal court to deny a habeas petition on the merits without requiring prior exhaustion of State remedies. It would require Federal habeas courts to refrain from granting relief with respect to matters that have been fully and fairly adjudicated in State proceedings in order to enhance the finality of State criminal adjudications and avoid duplicative litigation of claims that have been adequately considered.

In concurrence with the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Wainwright* versus *Sykes*, the legislation mandates that regardless of whether or not the petitioner deliberately bypassed State procedures, certain types of procedural defaults by a petitioner may not be excused unless the petitioner could establish "cause" and "actual prejudice" as a result of the default. The 1987 version of my legislation recognizes recent protections afforded petitioners by the U.S. Supreme Court by recognizing that the habeas corpus relief should be granted where there is evidence that a constitutional violation asserted in the claim probably resulted in a factually erroneous conviction or sentencing decision.

Madam Speaker, this area of the law is one of the remaining provisions of the President's original crime control agenda which has yet to be acted upon. Habeas corpus reforms can play an integral role in the overall effort to raise substance above the dilatory procedural tactics which have robbed our criminal justice system of the certainty of punishment. We've talked about getting tough on crime. We've talked about getting tough on drugs. It's my belief that we must bolster the tough talk with tough legislation—legislation which helps to establish a credible deterrent to crime. A reform of our habeas corpus statutes will represent an important step in that regard.

□ 1310

H.R. 1085, THE MONTGOMERY GI BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WYLIE. Madam Speaker, because I found it necessary to be off the floor during debate on the Montgomery GI bill and because of a personal interest I have in the legislation, I wish to express my strong support today of the action taken on Tuesday in approving H.R. 1085, the Montgomery GI bill. This legislation is appropriately named because of the dedication and perseverance of my good friend, Chairman MONTGOMERY that these educational benefits for our all volunteer armed services were originated and brought to the floor for a vote. It was his unwavering commitment to these men and women in uniform that brought the legislation to the House floor that will benefit young veterans and their country for generations to come.

I also believe that we should give special thanks to Congressman SOLOMON, the ranking member of the full Veterans' Affairs Committee, Congressman DOWDY, chairman of the Education, Training and Employment Subcommittee and Congressman CHRIS SMITH, the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Since enactment of the first GI bill in 1944, over 18 million veterans and service personnel have received educational assistance under three GI bills. These include 7.8 million under the World War II GI bill, and I was one of those 7.8 million who most likely would not have been able to attend Harvard Law School, if it had not been for the GI bill, almost 2.5 million servicemen received educational assistance under the Korean conflict GI bill, and over 8 million under the Vietnam-era GI bill.

Although the primary purpose of the new GI bill is to provide a readjustment educational benefit to our young men and women following service, the bill has also established itself as a major recruitment and retention tool. During the month of November 1986, 84 percent of all new Army recruits signed up for the new program; 54 percent of the Navy; 64 percent of the Marine Corps, and 44 percent of the Air Force. Dollar for dollar, the Montgomery GI bill program is the most cost-effective means of recruitment now in existence.

The Montgomery GI bill provides a low cost and patriotic means for the men and women who elect to serve their country to further their education and fully achieve their potential as American citizens.

H.R. 1085 is a fulfillment of our national obligation to assist servicemen in their efforts to be well educated and employable members of our society.

As a readjustment tool for veterans returning to the civilian world, the GI bill is a proven success. And, as an investment in the young men and women who have served their country,

the GI bill is a proven success. I join my colleagues in urging quick action by the other body.

GEOGRAPHY AWARENESS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution declaring the week of November 15 to November 21, 1987, as "Geography Awareness Week." This resolution complements one I recently introduced on foreign languages and international competitiveness that was offered as part of the observance of National Foreign Language Week. Senators BRADLEY and STAFFORD introduced an identical resolution on Geography Awareness Week in the U.S. Senate 2 days ago.

There is considerable evidence for the need to increase our attention to the important discipline of geography. In 1946, only 46 percent of college students tested in a nationwide survey at one top State university could name all of the Great Lakes. In 1984, the news was even worse: Only 12 percent of students surveyed at one top State university could name all of the Great Lakes. In 1950, 84 percent of these college students knew that Manila was the capital of the Philippines; by 1984, this number had shrunk to 27 percent. Furthermore, almost 70 percent of these students could not name a single country in Africa between the Sahara and South Africa.

This news is not only shocking; it is frightening. We depend on a well-informed populace to maintain the democratic ideals which have made and kept this country great. When 95 percent of some of our brightest college students cannot locate Vietnam on a world map, even after our extensive involvement in that country, we must sound the alarm. When 63 percent of the Americans participating in a nationwide survey by the Washington Post cannot name the two nations involved in the SALT talks, we must acknowledge that we are failing to sufficiently educate our citizens to compete in an increasingly interdependent world.

This ignorance of geography, along with a comparable lack of knowledge of foreign languages and cultures, places the United States at a disadvantage with other nations economically, politically and strategically. We cannot expect to remain a world leader if our populace does not even know who the rest of the world is!

In 1980, a Presidential commission found that U.S. companies fare poorly against foreign competitors partly because Americans are often ignorant of things beyond our borders. As Gov. Gerald Baliles said in a Southern Governors Association report, "Americans have not responded to a basic fact: the best jobs, largest markets, and greatest profits belong to those who understand the country with which they are doing business."

Japan's remarkable recovery since the end of the war has been the greatest economic success story of the century, much to the chagrin of many of her competitors. The success can be attributed to a number of factors, but I

do not think we can underestimate the importance of Japan's international marketing strategies, including especially its strong emphasis on other languages and cultures. The Japanese have deliberately prepared their businessmen and other professionals to operate in a global marketplace, with multicultural customers. They have learned the language, analyzed the needs, grasped the culture, and tried to understand the basic psyche of all potential consumers. It is estimated, for example, that there are 10,000 Japanese businessmen who speak English in the United States, while less than 1,000 Japanese-speaking American businessmen are in Japan.

One of the key themes and tasks for this Congress is restoring America's competitiveness in a highly complex, rapidly changing world. Improving our knowledge of the geography, language and culture of other lands is a concrete, attainable and important goal in the context of international trade and our place in the world economy. It is a substantial way to give content to the buzzword of competitiveness.

The understanding necessary to accomplish this, as I have said, can come only from knowledge of the peoples, cultures, resources and languages of other nations. This is the sort of knowledge that the study of geography seeks to impart. However, the discipline of geography is seriously endangered in this country. Departments of geography are being eliminated from many institutions of higher learning, and less than 10 percent of elementary and secondary school geography teachers have even a minor in the subject.

Madam Speaker, we are a nation with worldwide involvements. Our global influence and responsibilities demand an understanding of the lands, languages and cultures of the world. It is for this reason that I am today introducing this resolution to focus national attention on the integral role that the knowledge of world geography plays in preparing our citizens for the future of our increasingly interdependent, interconnected world. It is my hope that this will be just one step in a revitalization of the study of geography in this country. All of our citizens should have access to the type of education that will help them appreciate the great beauty and diversity of this Nation, and its place in an even more diverse world.

For your convenience, the text of the resolution follows:

H.J. Res. 195

Joint resolution to designate the period commencing November 15, 1987, and ending November 31, 1987, as "Geography Awareness Week."

Whereas the United States of America is a truly unique nation with diverse landscapes, bountiful resources, a distinctive multiethnic population, and a rich cultural heritage, all of which contributes to the status of the United States as a world power;

Whereas geography is the study of people, their environments, and their resources;

Whereas historically, geography has aided Americans in understanding the wholeness of their vast nation and the great abundance of its natural resources;

Whereas geography today offers perspectives and information in understanding ourselves, our relationship to the Earth, and our interdependence with other peoples of the world;

Whereas 20 percent of American elementary school students asked to locate the United States on a world map placed it in Brazil;

Whereas 95 percent of American college freshmen tested could not locate Vietnam on a world map;

Whereas 75 percent of Americans responding to a nationwide survey could not locate El Salvador on a map, while 63 percent could not name the two nations involved in the SALT talks;

Whereas over 20 percent of American teachers currently teaching geography have taken no classes in the subject and, therefore, do not have the training necessary to effectively teach geographic concepts;

Whereas departments of geography are being eliminated from American institutes of higher learning, thus endangering the discipline of geography in the United States;

Whereas traditional geography has virtually disappeared from the curricula of American schools while still being taught as a basic subject in other countries, including Great Britain, Canada, Japan, and the Soviet Union;

Whereas an ignorance of geography, foreign languages, and cultures places the United States at a disadvantage with other countries in matters of business, politics, and the environment;

Whereas the United States is a nation of worldwide involvement and global influence, the responsibilities of which demand an understanding of the lands, languages, and cultures of the world; and

Whereas national attention must be focused on the integral role that knowledge of world geography plays in preparing citizens of the United States for the future of an increasingly interdependent and interconnected world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the period commencing November 15, 1987, and ending November 31, 1987, is designated as "Geographic Awareness Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

WE NEED ANSWERS AND WE NEED ANSWERS FAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, the Senator from Wyoming has created deep concern in the other body and this one by suggesting that the President, at tonight's press conference, not answer any questions concerning Iran and the Contra affair that currently has the executive branch embroiled in the most serious matter of illegal conduct since Watergate.

I would hope that the President of the United States chooses not to follow his friend and ardent supporter's advice in this regard. I think that Mr. SIMPSON's advice to the President after 4 months of no press conferences would create an absolute scandal in addition to all of the problems that

the American people are concerned with.

We need answers and we need answers fast. As one who called for the special prosecutor in October of last year, and we finally were able to get one, and as one who intervened in the court process to ask that the special prosecutor have the widest latitude in tracing these endless branches of inquiry that keep opening up every week, and which I have applauded, and as one who has urged that the President take his State of the Union Address on January 27 and convert it to an opportunity where he tells the American people; First, what all of his subordinates know and knew about the matter and then, second, what he himself knew and then perhaps have someone else tell us what he forgot, then we would be able to get to the bottom of this matter.

In the present circumstance, we have so many limited grants of immunity flying around that the next thing I might expect the Senator from Wyoming to do is ask that the President be granted some form of limited immunity.

So I think that the President should not take just 30 minutes, which leaves an average of about 8 to 12 questions to be asked by members of the press who have been waiting for 4 solid months, but he should take 60 minutes or an hour and 30 minutes or 2 hours and finally sit down with the press, forget about the prepared speeches and all of the modern devices for communicating with the American people, but sit down with the press and talk with them about the Iran-Contra matter which is on all of our minds.

□ 1320

There are contradictions that have to be addressed. There are so many unanswered questions that it seems to me this is the least that the President can do under these circumstances; and a final recommendation that perhaps we ought to have press conferences from the executive branch of the Government every 2 weeks until we have resolved this matter.

THE FAMILY WELFARE REFORM ACT OF 1987

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Family Welfare Reform Act of 1987 which was developed by the Honorable HAROLD FORD of Tennessee, and his colleagues on the Public Assistance Subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation which includes a comprehensive, and much-needed, restructuring of the oldest wel-

fare program in the United States—the Aid to Families with Dependent Children [AFDC] Program which was created in 1935. I have the honor of serving as chairman of the Agriculture Committee's Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations, and Nutrition. This subcommittee has jurisdiction over the Food Stamp Program, which is a relative newcomer in our social welfare system—having only been established as a national program in 1972.

AFDC would be replaced by a new Family Support Program, which would be restructured to achieve the objective spelled out in the new program's name—support of families. This objective would be achieved through the following changes:

Benefits would be extended to families in which both the father and mother are present. This would remove the tragic financial incentive in the current AFDC Program for families to break up in order for the mother and children to receive welfare benefits. With this change, the Family Support Program would conform to the practice in the Food Stamp Program which extends benefits to everyone in a family who lives in the same household.

A new employment and training program for participants in the Family Support Program would be created. This program would allow States flexibility to design an employment and training approach which would best fit local conditions. This flexibility was incorporated in the Food Stamp Employment and Training Program enacted in the Food Security Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-198). Employment and training resources would be targeted to teen parent families, long-term recipients and families with young children.

To ensure that mothers can go to work or enter training without worrying about the welfare and safety of their children, increased funding for day care would be provided.

Work would be rewarded by ensuring that participants in the Family Support Program who work receive higher incomes than those who do not, and Medicaid benefits would be continued for recipients trying to make the transition from welfare to work.

The Child Support Enforcement Program would be restructured to ensure that parents meet their obligation to support their children.

The Family Welfare Reform Act of 1987 represents a sound basis on which to start reforming welfare. There are, however, two areas in which further work is needed if we are to achieve true welfare reform. These areas involve jurisdiction of House committees other than the Committee on Ways and Means.

The first is improved coordination and program simplification between the two largest welfare programs which provide benefits to families with children—Food Stamps and the Family Support Program. The Family Welfare Reform Act of 1987 would establish an advisory group to report on specific measures needed to ensure common policies in these two programs. This report would be submitted to the President and the Congress within 1 year after enactment of the Family Welfare Reform Act. The advisory group would be modeled after the Social Security Commission of a few years ago which included representation from the executive and legislative

branches as well as public and private groups interested in the issue. The advisory group to simplify the Food Stamp and Family Support Programs would include membership from the Departments of Agriculture and Health and Human Services, State Governors, State and local welfare administrators, Members of Congress, welfare advocates, and other appropriate persons.

I laud the creation of this advisory group but am concerned that we could end up with simply another study unless we start action now. We should not forget that what forced the compromise back in 1983 which saved the Social Security Program was not the Social Security Commission itself but the threat that the Social Security trust funds would go broke if no action was taken. There is no decision-forcing deadline in welfare reform. Therefore, I propose that the downpayment on improved program simplification and coordination be made now through inclusion in welfare reform this year of a series of changes to simplify the two programs. We should commit ourselves to adopting this year a simplification package which would be budget neutral.

My second concern is that we all ensure that employment and training for welfare recipients is coordinated. Unfortunately, over the years, we have tended to proliferate employment and training programs—in part out of frustration that the current delivery system does not reach welfare recipients. That is the reason why we have a separate employment and training program for food stamp and AFDC recipients. Since we are embarked on welfare reform, I think we should seize the opportunity to develop a coordinated employment and training system which will ensure that welfare recipients are not confronted with a bureaucratic maze as they attempt to obtain the skills needed to make the transition from welfare to work. Achievement of this objective will require careful coordination between the Committees on Education and Labor, Ways and Means, and Agriculture.

The Family Welfare Reform Act of 1987 represents an excellent first step toward welfare reform. Now it is the responsibility of the other committees in the House which have jurisdiction over programs that affect welfare recipients to ensure that we truly create a reformed welfare system that provides adequate benefits and real opportunities to make the transition from welfare to work.

THE NEW GI BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, by a vote of 401 to 2, the House passed and sent to the Senate H.R. 1085, a bill that would make the new GI bill permanent.

I did my best to recognize everyone who played a major role in developing the original bill, H.R. 1400, which we enacted in 1984, as well as H.R. 1085. When so many people are involved in a major piece of legislation, one always runs the risk of forgetting to mention some key players. I'm afraid I have done just

that. Madam Speaker, I shall attempt to correct the permanent RECORD to include five people that did an awful lot of work on the new GI bill from the very beginning until the vote yesterday.

Mrs. Candis Sniffen, legislative assistant for our committee, has been deeply involved in the new GI bill from the very beginning when the staff began a series of meetings with the military services back in 1980.

Another key individual has been Mr. Richard Shultz, an attorney for our committee, who has provided me with expert counsel in military matters, especially in the area of Reserve and National Guard affairs.

Mr. Bob Cover of the Legislative Counsel's Office did all of the drafting of the first bill I introduced in January 1981, H.R. 1400. Mr. Joe Womack of the Legislative Counsel's Office did all of the drafting of H.R. 1085 and legislation enacted last year to improve the program. If the new GI bill is made permanent, Bob Cover and Joe Womack will have played a major role in helping to bring about this new education program for our armed services. It is fitting that Bob and Joe are members of the team since they are responsible for drafting a lot of the legislation that comes out of the House Armed Services Committee, as well as the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I want Bob and Joe to know that all members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the staff, appreciate the many hours they spent in helping develop this program.

I'm also grateful to Mr. Hugh Evans, Senate legislative counsel who worked with Bob in putting together the conference agreement as part of the DOD Authorization Act of 1984. Hugh has worked closely with us for many years and he is a recognized expert in the areas of military and veterans' affairs.

THE FAIR TRADE AND ECONOMIC JUSTICE ACT OF 1987

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEASE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be joined by 34 of my colleagues today in introducing the Fair Trade and Economic Justice Act of 1987. This bill treats as an unfair trade practice the competitive advantage in international trade that some countries derive from the systematic denial of internationally recognized worker rights; that is, freedom of association; the right to organize and bargain collectively; a prohibition on the use of forced or compulsory labor; a minimum wage for the employment of children; and acceptable conditions of work with respect to wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health.

Currently, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the United States Code spell out the rules with regard to capital subsidies and dumping to promote fair competition, but not for labor practices. Anything goes. The current rules in world trade condone competition at any cost as far as workers are concerned.

But trade is not and should not be viewed as an end in itself. Fair competition in world trade should renounce labor repression and it

should be structured by rule and in practice to improve the living standards of workers as well as manufacturers and consumers. Therefore, we are committed to seeing this legislation become a part of the omnibus trade bill to be brought to the House floor before the end of April.

It is vital that the 1987 debate on trade avoid more rhetoric and center on constructive measures that spread trade's benefits as widely as possible. Trade can play a positive role in advancing the interests of a broad range of American businesses, consumers, and workers, while promoting gains in living standards in developing countries.

As international trade expanded rapidly after World War II, the United States gained trading partners across the developing world. At present, these poorer nations account for over a third of U.S. trade. There is, however, one especially heavy cost. Some governments rely on the brutal repression of their labor forces to produce goods cheaply for export:

In South Korea, 61 union leaders are serving long-term prison sentences for labor organizing.

In Chile, strike votes must be taken by open ballot under the surveillance of police or military authorities, marking strike advocates for retaliation.

In Taiwan, the right to strike is barred under penalty of death.

Labor repression has become a potent weapon in the arsenal of unfair trading practices that some foreign nations deploy to break into U.S. markets. Its impact on competing industries in the United States is similar to foreign government subsidies to exporters or dumping.

As the Congress strengthens its trade laws to advance fair trade and to authorize actions against unfair trade practices, it should recognize that the rights of workers are as much at stake in the trading system as the rights of producers and consumers.

Two important steps have already been taken:

First. The Trade and Tariff Act of 1984 contains language that limits the U.S. granting of trade preferences (under the Generalized System of Preferences—GSP) to countries that respect internationally recognized worker rights. The GSP, first adopted in 1974, grants duty-free treatment on imports into the United States for about 3,000 products from 140 developing countries. The 1984 changes prohibit the President from designating any country for GSP benefits which has not taken steps to afford internationally recognized worker rights to its labor force. Worker rights are defined to include: the right to association; the right to organize and bargain collectively; a prohibition on compulsory labor; a minimum age for the employment of children; and acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health.

Second. In 1985, new language in the reauthorization of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation [OPIC] restricts OPIC insurance and other operations to countries that have taken steps to adopt and implement laws respecting worker rights.

The United States has also embraced the trade/worker rights link as a primary negotiat-

ing objective in the new trade round at the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT].

The challenge that remains is to make labor repression an unfair trading practice in a new trade bill. Such an amendment was adopted as part of the 1986 trade bill that passed the House with an impressive bipartisan majority. The amendment placed labor repression alongside denial of market access, barriers to establishing a business in a foreign country, and violation of intellectual property rights as unfair trading practices against which the United States could take action. A motion to delete this provision was soundly defeated on the House floor by a 137-to-276 vote.

In the previous legislative campaigns, variations of seven questions have been raised about the trade/worker rights link. It is worthwhile to address each briefly in turn:

QUESTIONS

1. *Isn't making trade preferences contingent on worker rights a form of backdoor protectionism?*

Just the opposite is true. Public confidence in an open trading system depends on improvements in worker rights overseas. How, otherwise, can U.S. workers face imports from South Korea, Chile or any other country in which basic labor rights are non-existent, wages are but a fraction of ours, and to which U.S. multinational companies can transfer capital and technology at a drop of a hat? American workers are, and will continue to be, at an unfair disadvantage in competing with their counterparts in such countries.

However, improvements in working and living conditions abroad that the exercise of worker rights make possible can remove the affront felt by workers in the United States when repression is used to subsidize production. U.S. workers expect to see tangible evidence that trade with the United States fosters real gains for developing country workers. Without the improvement in labor rights conditions abroad, the pain of dislocation will continue to feed opposition to the current trade system.

2. *Do a set of internationally recognized worker rights exist that can serve as a gauge in trade legislation?*

They certainly do. Internationally recognized worker rights, as recognized in the GSP and OPIC legislation, are spelled out in bedrock International Labor Organization (ILO) conventions. These conventions were adopted after negotiations unique to the ILO. Representatives of U.S. management participated fully and equally with representatives of the U.S. government and U.S. labor. Most other national governments have taken the next step of ratifying these conventions:

105 countries have ratified convention No. 11 on the right of association and the right to organize;

113 countries have ratified convention No. 98 pertaining to the right to organize and bargain collectively;

109 countries have ratified convention No. 105 calling for the abolition of forced labor; 69 countries have ratified convention No. 5 fixing an age of 14 years as a minimum age for industrial employment;

46 countries have ratified convention No. 1 pertaining to hours of work and 32 countries have ratified convention No. 131 calling for the establishment of a system of minimum wages to cover wage earners.

In terms of U.S. law, the State Department, in appendix 2 of its 1986 Country Reports on Human Rights, defines each of the five "internationally recognized worker rights" for purposes of reporting and enforcing the Trade and Tariff Act of 1984.

3. *Isn't the U.S. being hypocritical in expecting other governments to respect rights based on ILO covenants that the United States Congress has not formally ratified?*

No. The U.S. Congress has long been reluctant to ratify international accords that will constrain U.S. law. For example, the Congress has never ratified the major GATT rules. It has nonetheless complied with GATT rules as though they were binding. Concerning worker rights, the important point is that the United States has adopted and enforced domestic laws that guarantee each of the five basic rights enumerated in the legislation.

4. *Don't these worker rights standards seek to dictate a U.S. minimum wage and OSHA standards for the rest of the world?*

Absolutely not. Four of the five rights, enumerated in the legislation are absolute rights. Either a country has child labor or it doesn't. Either it prohibits compulsory labor or it doesn't. The same is true of the rights to organize and to bargain collectively. Only the fifth right, the right to minimum standards with respect to health, safety and wages, requires subjective judgments. This right is deliberately phrased to take into account a country's level of development. It recognizes that, to a certain extent, differentials in wages between countries reflect different standards of living and economic systems.

As the costs of capital and the levels of productivity move closer across countries, however, labor costs have emerged as the major factor that differentiates costs of production in different countries. Unfortunately for workers across the globe, this leads to enormous pressure for governments to compete by offering the lowest wages possible. It also leads to violations of the already quite low minimum wage standards in many developing countries. The labor standards that now exist in the GSP attempt to hold governments accountable only to whatever minimum wage standards they have already set for their own country. Also, by pinpointing the right to organize and bargain collectively, they stress the need to give workers the right to negotiate acceptable working conditions.

5. *Is U.S. legislation linking trade and worker rights, as certain developing countries governments claim, a form of intervention into the sovereign affairs of other nations?*

No. First, the labor standards enumerated in the legislation are ones that most governments claim on paper to support: most of the violators have signed ILO conventions to this effect. Hence, this is not a case of imposing U.S. regulations; they are internationally recognized standards to which most countries are bound by international law.

Second, we do not propose that the U.S. automatically cut off trade with any nation on work rights grounds. Rather, the United States should have explicit authority to penalize egregious worker rights violators, not only by withholding trade preferences as the GSP law now provides, but by permitting broader discretion for sanctions—as it now provides for against violators as it does against other unfair trading practices.

It should come as little surprise that the governments most vehemently opposed to the trade/worker rights link tend to be the

least democratic and the worst violators of the broad range of human rights, e.g. South Korea, Taiwan, Chile and Zaire.

6. *Aren't worker rights a function of the stage of a country's development? Won't they tend to improve as countries develop?*

Some have advanced this hypothesis as an argument to drop the trade/worker rights link and instead focus on measures to help advance development in the developing world. We applaud these efforts, but the premise is not borne out by experience. Pharis Harvey, director of the North American Coalition for Human Rights in Korea, surveyed more than a dozen Asian countries to gauge their respect for the 5 worker rights set in the GSP and OPIC legislation. He discovered that a few of the least developed (e.g. Papua New Guinea and Fiji) scored quite well on basic rights; and several of the more developed (e.g. South Korea, Taiwan and Indonesia) scored quite poorly. The vital point, and one of the basic premises of the ILO, is that all workers around the world should be guaranteed certain basic rights.

7. *Can legislation that advances the trade/worker rights link actually improve worker rights overseas?*

Even though the legislative history of linking trade and labor rights is quite short, there are already positive signs that it can help advance worker rights. Evidence prepared by U.S. human rights, religious and labor groups over the past year, in connection with enforcement of the GSP provision, has demonstrated fundamental violation of worker rights in several countries.

Presentation of this evidence before the U.S. government prompted the U.S. Trade Representative's Office to send delegations to these countries to advise them that unless worker rights were improved, they would lose GSP status. In January 1987, the President invoked the worker rights clause to drop Paraguay, Romania and Nicaragua from the GSP, and to issue a warning against Chile. The benefits that accrue to developing nations through access to the vast U.S. market are ample incentive to improve working conditions if that is the price to retain access.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. RAVENEL) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WYLIE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PEASE, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAVENEL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. GILMAN in three instances.

Mr. RINALDO.

Mr. DELAY.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. BOULTER.

Mr. GRADISON.

Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS.

Mr. FAWELL.

Mr. DAVIS of Michigan.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. LELAND.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. SYNAR.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. KOLTER in two instances.

Mr. BEILSON.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. ASPIN.

Mr. TRAXLER.

Mr. BRUCE.

Mr. ROE.

Mrs. BYRON.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. WEISS.

Mr. LOWRY of Washington in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 23, 1987, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

927. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to make permanent the special pay provisions for enlistment and reenlistment bonuses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

928. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, to extend certain authorities thereunder, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

929. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Review of Receipts and Disbursements of the Office of the People's Counsel Agency Fund", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

930. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the 20th annual report on

progress in the operation of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4332; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

931. A letter from the Member, Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, transmitting the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities' 11th annual report on the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Program for fiscal year 1986, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 977; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

932. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a list of all General Accounting Office reports issued during the month of February, 1987, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Operations.

933. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of the agency's activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1986, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

934. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a report on the Corporation's compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during calendar year 1986, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

935. A letter from the Director, Office of Information and FOIA Officer, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's calendar year 1986 annual report of its activities under the Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

936. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, transmitting notification of an altered Federal records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

937. A letter from the Special Counsel, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a copy of the report of the Director, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, setting forth the findings and conclusions of the Director's investigation into allegations of a violation of law and regulation and a waste of funds at the Federal Correctional Institution, Texarkana, TX, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1206(b)(5)(A); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

938. A letter from the Administrator, Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control and data communications, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

939. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the educational assistance programs for veterans and eligible persons; to repeal the education loan program; and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Armed Services.

940. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Emergency Food and Shelter Program, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committees

on Agriculture and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

941. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the 12th annual report of the Corporation's Office of Consumer Affairs for the year 1986, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 57a(f)(6); jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BATES, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLINGER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FROST, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MRAZEK, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROE, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. WISE, Mr. GLICKMAN, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 1716. A bill to provide to employee of Government contractors protection against reprisal for disclosure to an appropriate Government official of information which the employee reasonably believes evidences misconduct relating to the contract with the Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BONKER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. DYSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. TALLON, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MANTON, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SAXTON, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. SWEENEY):

H.R. 1717. A bill to provide for a stronger competitive position for the United States in the understanding and wise use of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources by strengthening the National Sea Grant College Program and by initiating a new Strategic Marine Research Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 1718. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, with respect to patented processes and the patent cooperation treaty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself and Mr. MILLER of Washington):

H.R. 1719. A bill to protect the public's right to receive and communicate information freely beyond U.S. borders, and to

ensure the right of international travel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORD of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. COELHO, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. PEASE, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MOODY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. LELAND, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. ESPY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. DYMALLY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DIXON, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. MINETA):

H.R. 1720. A bill to replace the existing AFDC program with a new family support program which emphasizes work, child support, and need-based family support supplements, to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to encourage and assist needy children and parents under the new program to obtain the education, training, and employment needed to avoid long-term welfare dependence, and to make other necessary improvements to assure that the new program will be more effective in achieving its objectives; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition referred to the Committee on Education and Labor for consideration of such provisions of title I of the bill as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee under clause 1(G), rule X, and to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for consideration of such provisions of title IV of the bill as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee under clause 1(H), rule X.

By Mr. DAUB (for himself, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BAKER, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. DYSON, Mr. WORTLEY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WELDON, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. ESPY, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. SOLOMON, Ms. KAPUR, and Mr. MFUME):

H.R. 1721. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for an improved benefit computation formula for workers who attain age 65 in or after 1982 and to whom applies the 5-year period of transition to the changes in benefit computation rules enacted in the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (and related beneficiaries) and to provide prospectively for increases in their benefits accordingly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BYRON:

H.R. 1722. A bill to amend the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act, to encourage mediation and conciliation prior to bringing rights of action under that act, to permit reasonable attorneys' fees in certain cases in which a final order is entered in favor of the defendant, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1723. A bill to amend the Legal Services Corporation Act to ensure that the pro-

vision with respect to the payment of attorneys fees is strengthened, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COURTER:

H.R. 1724. A bill to require the President to submit to Congress annual reports on the proceedings of the Standing Consultative Commission established under the ABM Treaty of 1972; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Michigan (for himself and Mr. LENT):

H.R. 1725. A bill to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself and Mr. GRAY of Illinois):

H.R. 1726. A bill to restore income averaging for farmers who have suffered a natural disaster in the preceding taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOWRY of Washington (for himself, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BONKER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. CARR, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 1727. A bill to initiate strategic ocean and coastal resources research, to improve the National Sea Grant College Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

H.R. 1728. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to provide for limited extension of alternative means of providing assistance under the school lunch program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. ARMYE, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOUTLER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COATS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KYL, Mr. LAGOMARINO, Mr. LENT, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 1729. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered, and to prohibit the provision under title X of the Public Health Service Act of Federal family planning funds to organizations that perform or refer for abortions, except where the life of the mother would be endangered, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KASICH:

H.R. 1730. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LIGHTFOOT:

H.R. 1731. A bill to establish the Agricultural Export Reserve, and to define its functions; jointly, to the Committee on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 1732. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the reimbursement to State and local law enforcement agencies for costs incurred in investigations which substantially contribute to the recovery of Federal taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINETA:

H.R. 1733. A bill to make it clear that the space station being planned and developed by NASA is to be used for civilian purposes only; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. OKAR:

H.R. 1734. A bill to amend the Federal employee health benefit provisions of title 5, United States Code, to increase Government contribution rate, to extend coverage for employees who are separated due to reductions in force, to require carriers to obtain reinsurance or stop-loss insurance (or to otherwise demonstrate financial responsibility), to assure adequate mental health benefit levels and otherwise limit benefit reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEASE (for himself, Mr. CONTE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FRANK, Mr. TORRES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SABO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. McDADE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MOODY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. JONTZ):

H.R. 1735. A bill to treat the denial of internationally recognized worker rights as an unfair and unreasonable trade practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 1736. A bill to provide for the payment of impact aid to certain school districts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIDGE (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Miss SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 1737. A bill to provide access to trade remedies to small businesses, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Small Business.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.R. 1738. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase to \$150,000 the amount of group-term life insurance which may be provided by an employer and excluded from the gross income of an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROE (by request):

H.R. 1739. A bill to authorize appropriations for carrying out the National Climate Program for fiscal years 1988 and 1989; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

H.R. 1740. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1988 and 1989 for

the Office of Commercial Space Transportation of the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

H.R. 1741. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control and data communications, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. LELAND, Mr. HORTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COURTER, Mr. GALLO, and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H.R. 1742. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to grant local governments the discretion to assign mailing addresses to sites within their jurisdiction; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:

H.R. 1743. A bill to protect copyright computer programs from illegal copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VENTO (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1744. A bill to amend the National Historic Preservation Act to extend the authorization for the historic preservation fund; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 1745. A bill to amend the 1984 Tariff and Trade Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself and Mr. MADIGAN):

H.R. 1746. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend certain preventive health service programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 1747. A bill to deauthorize the Rockland Lake water resources project, Texas; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. LELAND, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MFUME, and Mrs. PATTERSON):

H.J. Res. 194. Joint resolution designating October 16, 1987, as "World Food Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.J. Res. 195. Joint resolution to designate the period commencing November 15, 1987, and ending November 31, 1987, as "Geography Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. PATTERSON (for herself, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TALLON, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. ESPY, Mr. ROE, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. HOWARD, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO):

H.J. Res. 196. Joint resolution to designate the week of May 10, 1987, through May 16, 1987 as "Senior Center Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WELDON (for himself, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. FLIPPO, and Mr. JENKINS):

H.J. Res. 197. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to Federal budget procedures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the mail fraud charges brought against Marcus Garvey by the Federal Government were not substantiated and that his conviction on those charges was unjust and unwarranted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself, Miss SCHNEIDER, Mr. RITTER, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. GEPHARDT, and Mr. STALLINGS):

H. Res. 127. Resolution relating to the semiconductor antidumping enforcement agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. WISE and Mr. BENNETT.
H.R. 162: Mr. BOSCO, Mr. YATRON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Ms. OKAR.

H.R. 276: Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOLTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. FISH, and Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.R. 303: Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. WELDON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. McDADE.

H.R. 371: Mr. MINETA and Mr. DIXON.
H.R. 573: Mr. FASCELL.

H.R. 593: Mr. OXLEY and Mr. SAVAGE.
H.R. 603: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Ms. SNOWE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mrs. SAIKI.

H.R. 666: Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. ECKART, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. FISH, Mr. HENRY, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 709: Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. SOLARZ.
H.R. 738: Mr. ECKART, Mr. GRANT, Ms. OKAR, and Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H.R. 778: Mr. PRICE of Illinois.
H.R. 896: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 922: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. STALLINGS.
H.R. 924: Mr. INHOFE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 951: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. MARLENEE, and Mr. PARRIS.

H.R. 957: Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. HOWARD, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 960: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. SWINDALL.

H.R. 1002: Mr. GARCIA and Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 1050: Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 1069: Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 1095: Mr. FIELDS, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. SUNIA, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 1186: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. LELAND, Mr. FRANK, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. SABO, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MARTINEZ,

Mr. MURPHY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MOODY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. HERTEL, and Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.R. 1228: Mr. WOLF, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. LATTI, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 1244: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 1281: Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. LELAND, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROE, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RODINO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. ROBINSON.

H.R. 1282: Mr. PARRIS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1313: Mr. FISH, Mr. ECKART, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. DERRICK.

H.R. 1483: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1524: Mr. WILSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 1536: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. HYDE, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.R. 1560: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. GREGG, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.J. Res. 32: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. GARCIA.

H.J. Res. 132: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FISH, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WELDON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MFUME, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. ROBINSON.

H.J. Res. 180: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. DORNAN of California.

H.J. Res. 182: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. FISH, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr.

CROCKETT, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COELHO, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. BADHAM, and Mr. DIXON.

H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. DAUB, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. TAUKE.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. AKAKA and Mr. PEASE.

H. Res. 53: Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. FISH.

H. Res. 68: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. WILSON.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 39: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1044: Mr. ANDERSON.